

225.85
W698

THE GENERAL THEOLOGICAL
SEMINARY LIBRARY

CHELSEA SQUARE, NEW YORK II, N. Y.



Dean Hoffman Fund

D & T BDY. JUL 15 '57

ST. PAUL AND PAGANISM

To the Memory of
MY BELOVED TEACHER
AUGUSTE SABATIER
*Professeur de l'Université
de Paris*

ST. PAUL AND PAGANISM

BY THE
REV. THOMAS WILSON, B.D.
STOW, MIDLOTHIAN

(THE GUNNING LECTURES, 1926)

THE GUNNING LECTURES, 1926

BY THE REV. THOMAS WILSON, B.D.

STOW, MIDLOTHIAN

EDINBURGH: T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET

1927

225.88

w698

84543

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY
MORRISON AND GIBB LIMITED

FOR

T. & T. CLARK, EDINBURGH

LONDON: SIMPKIN, MARSHALL, HAMILTON, KENT, AND CO. LIMITED

NEW YORK: CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
LIBRARY
1800 WARD

PREFACE

IN this book an attempt is made to show the influence of his pagan environment upon St. Paul. The book does not aim at proving that either St. Paul or his teaching is to be explained entirely in terms of that environment. But it recognises the admitted facts that St. Paul was a real man in a real environment, and that no man can be explained apart from the conditions in which he lives, and the influences which are brought to bear upon him.

The task undertaken is beset with many difficulties. It requires to be faced with caution and yet with courage, and with the desire to discover, as far as it is possible, the truth. Surely this is what St. Paul, of all men, would have himself desired.

It has to be frankly admitted that St. Paul was the heir of a vast heritage of religious and moral ideas, some of them Jewish, some of them pagan. That he was influenced by both is certain. How far this influence extended is the difficult problem that has to be solved. Similarity of ideas does not necessarily imply borrowing. But, on the other hand, where there was undoubted contact, the number of these similarities, and the striking nature of the resemblances, may lead us to infer that there is a very strong presumption in favour of concluding that a certain influence was exercised.

A helpful parallel may be found in Shakespeare. No

one questions the supremacy of Shakespeare in the field of dramatic art and creation. But no one can deny that he employed material already to hand, some of it, *e.g.* *King Lear* and *Julius Cæsar*, very old. St. Paul, equally great as a genius of the religious and moral life, in like manner can only be understood in the light of the religious and moral traditions and ideas of his own and previous ages.

No better way of approaching the study could be found than to do so in keeping with the spirit of the apostle's own words: "Is He the God of the Jews only? Is He not also of the Gentiles? Yes, of the Gentiles also." "For we can do nothing against the truth, but for the truth."

Chapters II., IV., V. and VIII. formed the substance of the Gunning Lectures delivered in Edinburgh University during November and December 1926. The rest of the material has been added to make the treatment more complete.

T. W.

12th November 1927.

CONTENTS

CHAP.	PAGE
I. INTRODUCTORY	1
II. THE PAGAN ENVIRONMENT	31
III. THE MEDIATOR	63
IV. ST. PAUL AND THE MYSTIC WAY	82
V. ST. PAUL AND THE PAGAN GUILDS	120
VI. RELIGION, MORALITY, SALVATION	136
VII. THE SACRAMENTAL	171
VIII. DEATH AND THE AFTERWARDS	185
IX. ST. PAUL AND THE MODERN MIND	228
INDEX	279

ST. PAUL AND PAGANISM

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTORY

THE world into which St. Paul was born, and in which he lived his life, was a world with a great and manifold heritage—philosophical, historical, political, psychological, social, moral, and religious. It was a world enriched by the genius of Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, and a multitude of others, men of original mind and titanic grasp. It was a world wherein men had been seeking God long and ardently¹—a world in which multitudes of earnest men had wrestled till they fell, striving to find a way out, seeking to discover some means of deliverance from the iron grip of fate, human suffering, and bewilderment.²

It is no disparagement of St. Paul to say that he was the child of his environment. Every man, inasmuch as every man is a distinct personality, is original. But only in a sense analogous to this, that every flower differs somewhat from every other flower. Each flower is the creation of sun, air, water, and mother earth. So every

¹ "The true point of view was anticipated by St. Paul, when he spoke of the old Hellenic worship as a feeling after God" (Lewis Campbell, *Religion in Greek Literature*, p. 383).

² The struggle of mankind for spiritual freedom may be regarded as going on from the time that man became man. Speaking of the chimpanzee and dog as contrasted with man, Macalister says: "A round of birth; of eating, sleeping, and reproduction of the species; and then of death, finally terminating the activities of the individual. So far back as we can trace Man, he is fighting against this monotonous routine." Cp. *A Text-book of European Archæology*, i. p. 96.

man is the creation of God, heredity, tachygenesis, environment, and his own individual efforts. When we include God, we make possible that special inspiration which we claim for the great apostle.

Each man, to begin with, is the child of tradition—intellectually, morally, and religiously the child of tradition. So it was with St. Paul, in whose case the dominant factors were, no doubt, Judaism and Jesus Christ. But who can deny, especially in the light of his own ready acknowledgment of indebtedness, that St. Paul was largely the child of pagan tradition also?

We must remember that St. Paul was a son of Tarsus, a son of one of the Roman provinces. That alone explains a great deal. There is no reason to believe that the exercise of Roman rule produced any essential change in the distinctive Græco-Oriental character of such a town as Tarsus was. But Roman government meant the reign of good order, security of life and goods, and usually a higher standard of material well-being. The provinces, under the Empire, enjoyed many benefits hitherto unknown. Roman law brought in the exercise of even-handed justice. Roman rule provided splendidly built roads, an imperial post, and the use of the denarius and the Roman gold piece as legal tender throughout the Empire. Roman business instincts and habits improved economic conditions and gave legitimate trade a secure standing.

At the time when St. Paul was born, the problem of Imperial Rome was not the conquest of the world, but the organisation, consolidation, and civilisation of a world already conquered. Government was usually much better administered in the provinces than in Rome, and life pursued its course more evenly there than in the capital city itself. Roman rule did not destroy the freedom of the provincials. The laws directed against certain philosophers simply aimed at checking their interference with political matters. There was an enormous produc-

tion of cheap books,¹ made possible by the labours of the librarii, or educated slaves, who were usually Greeks. Two public libraries were established in Rome by Augustus, and others were added by his successors. All this was in the atmosphere which St. Paul breathed from the first.

Then, as to pagan morals, there were two sides. St. Paul's picture, in the first chapter of Romans, gives one—the worse. Gladiatorial shows were brutalising. Enormous depravity was associated with the theatrical displays. Luxury and gross self-indulgence were all too common; but, as Friedländer has pointed out, it is easy to exaggerate this side of Roman life.² There was another. The very fact that life was lived so much in the open, and that games played such an important part, must have tended towards cleanness and manliness. Particularly in certain of the provinces, there was a robust middle class, which was marked by fidelity to marriage vows, kindness, honour, and general well-doing. Chiefly through the influence of Stoicism, the idea of a world-wide brotherhood had taken firm hold of the minds of men. Sympathetic interest in the sick and poor, and practical ministration to their wants, were common. And while, legally, slaves were mere goods and chattels, there were many cases where they were treated as members of the household, particularly the vernæ, or slaves born in the home. There are many inscriptions which bear testimony to the affection of masters borne towards their faithful slaves. Generally speaking, the slaves in a town were better off than the slaves in the country. This is important in view of the fact that St. Paul was essentially a man of the bigger cities.

As regards religion, Roman rule was marked by a magnificent spirit of toleration,³ although notable ex-

¹ Evidence of the large number of copies of one particular book is provided by the fact that two thousand of the Pseudo-Sibylline Oracles were destroyed by the orders of Augustus.

² *Roman Life and Manners*, ii. pp. 131 ff.

³ Stoicism, with its doctrine that all divinities are eventually manifestations of the one foundation deity, influenced Roman rule in its spirit of toleration. To respect the religious prejudices of con-

ceptions to this general practice were its stern antagonism towards the schools of the Druids, and, for a time, towards the religion of Isis, the reason being that these were felt to be politically dangerous.¹ In the early days of Christianity, Rome was a protecting power. But for its strong right arm, the faith would almost certainly have been stamped out by the bigoted Pharisees. And when, later on, Rome did become a persecutor, the reasons were that Christianity was regarded not as a national faith, but as the creed and practice of a denationalised sect, that Rome always disapproved of private associations even if of a harmless nature,² that the Christians were unpatriotic,³ that they were intolerant of all other religions, and, in short, were "atheists."

Then as regards St. Paul's philosophy of history, that is entirely Jewish and Christian. He knows nothing of the modern conception of the solidarity of the human race, by which all men are indissolubly bound together by human instincts and social ties, nothing of the conception that one generation is linked on to another as cause and effect. The corner-stone of his philosophy of history is the sovereignty of God,⁴ which is particularly

quered peoples was the soundest policy to pursue in seeking to reconcile these peoples to Roman rule. The Romans showed a remarkable facility in rediscovering their own deities, under different names, in the divinities of other nations.

¹ Cp. Suet. *Claud.* 25; Tac. *Ann.* xiv. 29-31.

² The meetings of the Christians were secret and often nocturnal. Tacitus describes the Christians as "this mischievous sect," and accuses them of being guilty of "hatred of human kind." They were said to hold wild orgies and to feast on human flesh. These false calumnies are to be explained partly through the secrecy of the Christian assemblies, and partly because there were certain small Christian communities that did practise evil rites. Cp. E. G. Hardy, *Studies in Roman History*, pp. 129 ff.

³ In early Christianity we find a twofold tradition in regard to the nature of the Roman State. On the one hand, as in the *Revelation* of St. John, the State was the visible rule of demons; on the other hand, it was "the minister of God," and the protector, as in St. Paul's writings. The acceptance of Jesus Christ as the Divine Son logically led the Christians into opposition to Cæsar-worship.

⁴ Christ's conception of the sovereignty of God is set forth in His teaching in regard to the kingdom of God. It embraces the following: (1) the kingdom is a new order of things on earth (a Jewish idea); (2) the kingdom is not of this world (*i.e.* does not proceed from the present evil age), but is from God; (3) repentance is necessary to

shown in Divine election—in the election of Israel, and, later on, in the election of the Gentile church. The co-operation of the human will is not even necessary to God's plan of salvation. It is altogether a matter of God's free choice and mercy, and even if the objection is raised that the principle of Divine election¹ seems to militate against the Divine justice and against moral government, St. Paul would answer that we have no right to criticise God's methods. Yet St. Paul aims at not regarding God's will as absolutely arbitrary, nor does he wish to make the exercise of His sovereign power annul His moral attributes.

To St. Paul, all history is to be regarded as the preparation for, and the achievement of, redemption.² He is deeply impressed by the contrast between the first and second Adam, and by what each of them signifies in the shaping of history, and between the now prevailing age of wickedness and the coming age of righteousness. All pre-Christian history is a preparation for the coming of Christ; all subsequent history is a working out of His scheme of redemption.

Starting from the general thesis that sin and death originated in Adam's sin of disobedience, and that consequently all are sinners who have brought the two-fold curse upon themselves, he divides the life of man on earth into three epochs: (1) from Adam to Moses—the state of sin without knowledge of the Law, and without conviction of sin produced by knowledge of the Law; (2) from Moses to Christ—the state of sin under the Law,

have a share in it (the ethical element); (4) it is at once a present and a coming kingdom, coming in fullness and glory. St. Paul's conception of the kingdom (sovereignty) of God is substantially the same as that of Jesus.

¹ St. Paul's doctrine of election is (1) mainly derived from the Old Testament teaching; (2) applies to the individual as such; (3) involves the supreme sovereignty of God in all things, yet does not deny personal freedom (the problem of conflict between these two does not seem to arise in the consciousness of the apostle).

² Clement of Alexandria regarded Greek philosophy as a kind of covenant (*διαθήκη*) given to them by God, as a preparation for receiving the higher philosophy of Christ. Cp. *Strom.* vi. 8.

with the consciousness of guilt emphasised because of the knowledge of the Law ; (3) from Christ onwards—the state of deliverance from the Law, sin, and death, through the power of the Cross, a state shared in by all believers, and open to all who will accept the gospel, the period during which the Messianic State will be gradually completed.¹ As regards all this, St. Paul borrowed nothing from his pagan environment.²

It is otherwise when we turn to the general philosophy which his teaching involves. Here, even if St. Paul is always more a religious teacher than a philosopher strictly speaking, he shows unmistakable evidence of the influence of philosophic ideas and conceptions which had been handed down from various sources.³ It has always to be remembered, however, that St. Paul was never a university student, but just a well-educated artisan, and something of an expert in rabbinical learning. It is as certain as anything can be that he had no direct acquaintance with the great masterpieces of Greek philosophy and poetry, that he had never read, probably never heard of, such works as Plato's *Republic* or Aristotle's *Ethics*. His school was the school of practical contact, his teacher the thought environment.

Long before St. Paul's day, Plato had revealed to the minds of men his wonderful world of Ideas, which were at once universals and pure qualities, with God, the Good, as the absolute Idea, "the crown and essence of the Ideas."⁴ Plato had also taught that the origin of the

¹ Cp. Sanday and Headlam, *Romans*, pp. 344–7.

² Yahweh was from the first a God of redemption (deliverance from Egypt).

³ Speaking of St. Paul, Clemen says : " For though he certainly possessed no Greek learning, still he and other Christian writers are likely to have come in contact with contemporary philosophy." Cp. *Pauline Christianity and its Non-Jewish Sources*, p. 32 ; cp. also p. 73. Clemen thinks that this philosophy was, above all, Stoicism as it had become modified under Platonic influences.

⁴ Cp. Erdmann, *History of Philosophy*, i. p. 112. " In Platonism, there was the theory of the one God, shaping matter according to an infinite variety of patterns " (Hatch, *The Influence of Greek Ideas and Usages upon the Christian Church*, p. 180). Celsus maintained that Jesus borrowed His ideas mainly from Plato, vulgarising them ; cp. Origen, *Celsus*, vi. 16. Drews, in modern times, holds that Christ,

world was due to God impregnating matter with the Good, so that the world was at once the *υἱὸς μονογένης* and the *εἰκὼν τοῦ Θεοῦ*, and that thereby the sensible world is to some extent a sharer in the attributes of God. The human soul he had proclaimed to be the direct creation of Deity, endowed with pre-existence and immortality, and, in the spirit of Kant in later days, had regarded retribution as a necessity in order that justice might truly be executed, and indeed as a proof of immortality. Aristotle had affirmed the independence, freedom, and immortality, though not in a personal sense, of the *νοῦς ποιητικός*.

In all this there is at once similarity and difference between the teaching of these philosophic giants and the thought of St. Paul. The influence of these and other great thinkers had been flowing like a mighty Atlantic Drift through the intellectual life of the world, as it is flowing still. But, just as men in our own islands experienced for ages the genial warmth which that current brings, without having any conception of its source in the sunny South, so St. Paul could not fail to be influenced by the vivifying thought of the great ones of the past, even when he had no direct knowledge of their respective writings. St. Paul's knowledge of God and immortality was part of the sacred heritage which he had received from his own people and from the immediate influence of Jesus Christ on his life. These had taught him to appreciate the personal nature of God and His tender and direct interest in men, in a way that none of the Greek thinkers ever could have taught him. Still it could not be without influence, in moulding and in modifying his thought, to find ideas and beliefs of purely pagan origin which were, at least in some measure, cognate to those which he had inherited and derived from his Risen Lord and from Judaism.

the Mediator of St. Paul, is to be identified with the Platonic Eros ; cp. *The Christ Myth*, p. 198. To Plato, God is not merely an Idea ; He is the Personal God, "the best soul," ἀρίστη ψυχή ; cp. A. E. Taylor, *Plato*, pp. 442, 490-2.

In St. Paul's day, Epicureanism and Stoicism had each a great multitude of followers. At first Greek philosophical thought had been regarded with suspicion by the Romans. But, since 200 B.C., various Greek philosophical systems had laid hold of Rome, and the same applied in a less degree to the West throughout.¹ Both these systems had this in common with St. Paul, that they stood aside from political life.

That St. Paul was acquainted with the tenets of Epicureanism is shown by his own words,² though his knowledge of these was almost certainly not through its literature, but from the people, holding its doctrine, with whom he came in contact. It was a system which was almost altogether alien and even antagonistic to St. Paul's manner of life and thought.

In the case of Stoicism, it was different. The mere fact that it affirmed that human nature shared in the divine, and that it held up the ethical ideal of a calm and fearless manhood, would commend it to St. Paul, as to the better class of Romans. Stoicism has been called "a Semitic philosophy" by Cumont.³ It had, moreover, peculiar associations with Tarsus.⁴

Other points suggestive of a certain resemblance between the Stoics and St. Paul will occur when we are

¹ Cp. Felten, *Neutest. Zeitgesch.* ii. 485. Speaking of Epicureanism, Friedländer says "there is no positive evidence of its spread in the Roman world under the empire"; cp. *Roman Life and Manners*, iii. p. 248. Friedländer thinks, however, that, next to Stoicism, Epicureanism had the largest number of adherents.

² 1 Cor. xv. 32.

³ Cp. *Astrology and Religion among the Greeks and Romans*, p. 82. Cumont points out that "the masters of the Stoic school are for the most part Orientals."

⁴ Chrysippus and others belonged to that city; cp. Böhlig, *Die Geisteskultur von Tarsos*, S. 108 ff. It has to be noted that, in vivid contrast to the university of Alexandria, which was strongly cosmopolitan, the university of Tarsus was distinctively national in character, and therefore conservative. It has also to be remembered that, in a way to which there is scarcely a parallel in modern life, the university then exercised a direct influence upon the life of the people; cp. Böhlig, *Die Geisteskultur von Tarsos*, S. 111. Böhlig holds that it was not by pure Stoicism that St. Paul was influenced, but by the "syrisch-hellenistische Mystik, die auch die Stoa umgebildet hat"; cp. *op. cit.* S. 82.

dealing with special points of doctrine ; but, in the meantime, it may be pointed out that, while Stoicism is founded on a thorough-going materialism, it affirmed the existence of an active, creative, formative, guiding principle, along with the passive principle. This cosmic creative force is God, who is immanent in the world, and has given a fragment of His nature to man. True citizenship was that of the Cosmos ; true ethics were the realisation of life in harmony with Nature, that is, with God ; true worship was knowing and obeying God. Further, the Stoics were at one with St. Paul in affirming the importance of conscience, which to them was the judge of a man's actions, in demanding the manly exercise of will, constant self-examination, and imitation of good example. Like him, too, they emphasised the need of constant training and discipline, in view of the fact that life is a ceaseless warfare, a kind of athletic contest which must be unhesitatingly faced. Like St. Paul also, they were deeply moved by the spectacle of moral failure and depravity in the contemporary world, and in working earnestly for the realisation of a higher ideal of life, they felt it to be incumbent upon them to make a manly stand against all prevailing prejudice and vice. One might even find a certain suggestion of St. Paul's conception of the Christian saint in the sage, or ideally wise man, of the Stoics.¹

In studying the relationship of St. Paul to paganism, and the influence of the latter on his life and thought, it is important to remember that the problems of Græco-

¹ Of all the philosophical systems of antiquity, Stoicism came nearest to St. Paul's thought. It was essentially a preaching philosophy, a religion, even a Gospel of deliverance, rather than a mere philosophy. It has to be remembered, however, that the foundation of St. Paul's morality is different from that of the Stoics. Christian morality rests on the Divine commands, on the expression of God's personal will ; Stoic morality rests on the law of God or Nature. The reason for this difference was that Christianity had inherited Jewish theocracy. Fundamentally, its ethic was of Palestine, not of Greece. Philosophy, as such, would not be attractive to St. Paul, the Jew, and the son of the people : " Bei der grossen Menge waren die Philosophen unbeliebt " ; cp. Felten, *Neut. Zeitgesch.* ii. S. 486.

Oriental philosophy and religion were also the problems to which Christianity offered a solution—the relationship of God to the world, and to man in particular, the dualism of good and evil, of spirit and matter, of reason and the senses, of life and death, of the present world and the world of the hereafter, of health and sickness, of optimism and pessimism, of fate and freedom.¹

In dealing with these perennial problems, paganism had already laid firm hold of much that was congenial to the mind of Christianity. There was reverence felt towards antiquity, for example towards Homer. St. Paul, however widely he differed from the Pharisee in his later life, never ceased to honour the fathers. Paganism believed, in its own way, quite as much in the inspiration of its great poetry, as the Christian did in the inspiration of the Hebrew prophets. In keeping with this, both pagan and Christian alike could appeal to the authority of their inspired writings and writers.²

Wernle is right in saying that "there are far more points of contact between the Greeks and St. Paul's practice, than between them and his theology."³ Still no one can study the development of his theological thought as presented in his letters, without realising how profoundly he was influenced by contemporary philosophical and religious thinking. The mustard tree of Christianity was deeply rooted, and grew to maturity, in the rich soil of the ancient philosophies and religions. No New Testament writer shows this more clearly than St. Paul;⁴ and, in the light of this fact, it is even com-

¹ There is much truth in what Lewis Campbell says: "The great historical religions of the world stand or fall together;" cp. *Religion in Greek Literature*, p. 384.

² e.g. the words of Homer were appealed to as a moral sanction for some ethical principle. Just as St. Paul read Christianity into the Old Testament, the Stoics found their doctrines in the Greek poets.

³ Cp. *Beginnings of Christianity*, i. p. 222. The two reasons for this were that St. Paul was thoroughly grounded in Jewish theology in his youth, and always remained essentially a Jew, and because the problems that arose with his Gentile converts were mainly practical.

⁴ Long before St. Paul's day, his people, the Jews, had allowed themselves to be influenced by pagan beliefs. "The recent discovery of an Aramaic manuscript of the fifth century at Elephantine has

prehensible how Jews of a later date asserted that St. Paul was "the son of a Greek father and a Greek mother," Tarsus people, and that he went to Jerusalem, became a proselyte, and was circumcised.¹

It is often remarked that the present age is bewildering in the variety and complexity of its ideas and strivings. The same must have been felt by men of St. Paul's age. On the one hand, it was an age of thought, culture, and literary activity; on the other hand, there was a vast area of untutored ignorance and superstition. On the one hand, it was an age of lofty metaphysical conceptions; on the other hand, a large proportion of the population lived in the circumscribed bounds of a crass and narrowing materialism. On the one hand, there were moral forces struggling, with an energy hitherto unequalled, for the redemption of social and religious life; on the other hand, there were, even in the high places of the earth, revolting exhibitions of vice and degradation.

The most hopeful features of the age were the demand for moral reformation in society, personal purity, and the inner mystical life of communion with God, which we find in the Mystery religions. Happily there have been preserved to us rich sources, though by no means richer than we desire, from which we can interpret the life, and get glimpses into the minds of the men and women of that age. These sources are the literature,²

enabled us to show how the romance of Ahickar passed from the banks of the Euphrates to the Jewish communities of Palestine and Egypt (to which it furnished the motive of the Book of Tobit)"; cp. Cumont, *Astrology and Religion among the Greeks and Romans*, p. 66; cp. Cowley, *Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century B.C.*, pp. 204 ff. "We may regard it as indisputable that before the Exile (597 B.C.), Israel received from Babylon, along with some astronomical knowledge, certain beliefs connected with star-worship and astrology"; cp. Cumont, *Astrology and Religion among the Greeks and Romans*, p. 78.

¹ Cp. Epiph. *Hær.* xxx. 16.

² The literature is chiefly the work of people who were unbelievers, or indifferent—people who sought to spiritualise, transform, undermine, religious belief. The monuments and papyri records, on the other hand, bear witness to the simplicity and sincerity of the popular belief; cp. Friedländer, *Roman Life and Manners*, iii. p. 84. "Outside philosophical circles proper, the religious views, current in the educated

the monuments, and the papyri. From the two latter specially, it is possible to get glimpses into the very soul of the people, which is the one effective way of understanding their religious beliefs.¹

Apart from Judaism and Christianity, the religious life of St. Paul's day might be grouped under the four heads: religion or worship of the home, State or city worship, Cæsar-worship, and the Mystery religions. We shall deal with the first three at this time, reserving the last for future chapters.

The worship of the family gods or lares² probably arose out of the ancient Roman custom of burying their dead in the house. These lares were believed to reside on the hearth of the atrium, and the lar familiaris was regarded as the head of the family. When a man swore by his own hearth, he made the most solemn and binding of oaths. The religion of the household gods was very much a religion of meat and drink. Bound up, as it was, with the life of the family, it showed a marvellous vitality, persisting amid many changes and disillusionments of the larger religious life outside.

The State religion³ which Augustus had sought to revive, aimed at the rehabilitation of the traditional gods, at a time when they were largely discredited.⁴ There is

Roman world of the first century A.D., fluctuated between belief in the existence of the popular gods and a providence of which they were the agents (although the entire legendary tradition was rejected), on the one hand, and an absolute negation of the gods, on the other"; cp. Friedländer, *Roman Life and Manners*, iii. p. 87. Tacitus held the former view, the elder Pliny the latter.

¹ "It has been said that all study of popular religion is a study of popular psychology"; cp. Farnell, *Greek Hero-Cults and Ideas of Immortality*, p. 71.

² The most probable explanation of the "Teraphim" is that these were lares or household gods; cp. Lods, *La Croyance à la vie future*, pp. 234-5. Sacrifices were offered to these Teraphim; cp. Charles, *Eschatology*, pp. 201 ff.

³ Cp. Grenier, *Le Genie romain*, p. 437.

⁴ Financial support for polytheism had dwindled away. The Epicureans rejected the current belief in the popular gods, without absolutely denying their existence. This was the view held by many educated people, even when, for political or social reasons, they took part in the rites of the State religion. Many disbelieved altogether in the gods. Speaking of Seneca, Glover says, "He saw clearly enough

reason to believe that Augustus did not believe in them himself. But, with clear political insight, he recognised that religion was necessary to sound morality,¹ the maintenance of good order, and political stability.

Cæsar-worship had indirectly its precedent in hero cult,² in the deification of outstanding men, particularly physicians.³ A direct precedent was afforded in the divine honours attributed to Alexander the Great even during his lifetime.⁴ Julius Cæsar also received divine honours during his lifetime, and his statue was placed alongside of the gods.⁵ Previous to being bestowed on a Cæsar, the title "Augustus" had been reserved for the gods alone. The senate ordained that henceforth, in every home, sacrifice should be made to the genius of Augustus alongside of that offered to the lares.⁶ Tiberius had a temple built to Augustus' honour, a

that there was no truth in them" (the popular gods); cp. *The Conflict of Religions*, p. 49.

The Stoics affirmed not only the existence of God (the primitive force), but also that there were many gods sharing in this original deity, e.g. the stars, elements, etc. At the same time, they rejected the popular mythology. Still they approved of the popular religion, in so far as it helped the ordinary man to abstain from licentiousness, and to attain to self-restraint.

St. Paul made a clear distinction between the demons and the pagan gods or idols. To him, the latter were nothing; the former were realities. In this he was at one with a great many pagans.

¹ The purpose of Augustus was to restore the wholesome morality of the earlier ages of Roman history—the morale which had made Rome great. Cp. Dessau, *Geschichte der Römischen Kaiserzeit*, i. S. 75 ff.

² e.g. Herakles, Hippolytus, Asklepios, etc.; cp. Farnell, *Hero Cults and Ideas of Immortality*, pp. 65, 100 ff., 154, 234, 236-7, 278. Of Asklepios, Farnell says, "His cult came to overshadow the whole of the later Græco-Roman world"; cp. p. 234.

³ We remember that Christ was the Good Physician, and that the ministry of the Pauline churches was largely a ministry of healing.

⁴ Cp. Arrian, vii. 23, 29; Diod. xviii. 28. Similarly the Ptolemies from the time of Philadelphus, and the Seleucidæ from the time of Antiochus II. Theos. Intimately bound up with Cæsar-worship was the conception of the Dea Roma, to whom a temple was dedicated at Smyrna, 195 B.C. (cp. Tacit. *Ann.* iv. 56), and at Alexandria in Caria, 171 B.C. (cp. Livy, xliii. 6).

⁵ Cp. Diod. xlii. 4; Appian, *Bell. Civ.* ii. 106; Cic. *Phil.* ii. 43, 110, xiii. 19, 41.

⁶ "Augustus ist schon bei Lebzeiten vielfach im Osten wie im Westen des Reiches, auch in Italien selbst, als Gott verehrt worden"; cp. Wissowa, *Religion und Kultus der Römer*, S. 80. The title "Augustus" was given on 16th January 27 B.C.

college of priests established, and a flamen Augustalis appointed.

Thus, even before St. Paul's day, Cæsar-worship was a firmly established fact of the religious life of the Roman empire; and when we remember that, apart from the larger opportunities of contact which came to St. Paul in the days of his active ministry, Tarsus was the meeting-place of the concilium of Cilicia, and that "the principal function of these provincial concilia was the due performance and maintenance of the worship of Rome and the reigning Emperor,"¹ we can realise that, at a very early period of his life, he must have become aware of the existence of this form of worship. It is unlikely, however, that the conception of the Cæsar as the divine son had any formative influence on St. Paul's belief in Jesus Christ as the Son of God.² Rather would he see in the spurious divinity of the Cæsar, a travesty of the real and only divinity of his Risen and Glorified Lord. At the same time, it must have been a constant problem for St. Paul to deal with those who had accepted the belief in the divinity of the Cæsars, and whom he wanted to bring to the knowledge of the Divine Son, Jesus Christ, his Lord.

It was fortunate for St. Paul that he could still think of the Roman empire with its various religions, not as an enemy to the death to Christianity, but as a protector and a minister of God. It does not imply any betrayal of his Christian faith, to think of him as studying sympathetically pagan beliefs, discovering certain points of contact with Christianity, and, in any case, utilising the beliefs, formerly held by his Gentile converts, to bring out all the more clearly the truth as it is in Jesus. One thing, however, has always to be borne in mind, namely that, in none of those pagan religions, and not even in

¹ Cp. Jackson and Lake, *The Beginnings of Christianity*, i. p. 204.

² Bousset gives as reasons for not bringing into close relationship St. Paul's conception of the "Son of God" and the divine sonship of the Cæsar-cult: (1) in St. Paul's time the Cæsar-cult did not yet possess the dominating position which it had later on; (2) as applied to the Cæsars, the term *Divi filius* was of a concrete and limited connotation. Cp. *Kyrios Christos*, S. 182.

Judaism, is there anything that is the equivalent of faith as understood by St. Paul¹—that faith which is the very foundation of his understanding of the gospel.

We shall now deal with some of the more outstanding features of St. Paul's doctrine, as indicating evidences of the influence of the pagan environment, and we shall begin with St. Paul's conception of the universe. All things, to the mind of St. Paul, were originally the creation of God—in keeping with his inherited Jewish belief, the creation by the word of His mouth.² That God, the Creator, is One and Sovereign lies at the basis of St. Paul's theology.³ He does not affirm that Nature is identical with God; but he does affirm that originally Nature is altogether the created work of God, and, as such, good.⁴ He does not affirm the permanence of the existing material universe,⁵ nor ignore the stern fact of that evil which has crept in and is dominant in the present age; but, just because he never loses sight of the sovereignty of God,⁶ he unhesitatingly affirms the coming of the time when God will be "all in all."⁷

¹ Cp. W. H. P. Hatch, *The Pauline Idea of Faith* (Harvard Theological Studies). In Philo, faith is "a sure and certain conviction," and, according to Bousset, was borrowed from the Stoics; cp. *Kyrios Christos*, SS. 174-5. This is, at best, only a fragment of the larger mystical conception of the faith as held by St. Paul.

² This conception was not peculiarly the possession of Judaism. In the Egyptian religion, creation is effected by the Divine Word; cp. Maspero, *Histoire ancienne des peuples de l'Orient classique*, pp. 147 ff. We cannot suppose, however, that St. Paul was directly influenced by the Egyptian religion; cp. 2 Cor. iv. 6, Acts xvii. 24 (which, if not the actual words of St. Paul, may be confidently taken as expressing his view).

³ Cp. 1 Cor. viii. 6.

⁴ In this respect, St. Paul differs from the Stoics, who identify God with Nature, in keeping with their essentially monistic and materialistic view of the universe. Pliny, a contemporary of St. Paul, makes Nature and God the same thing.

⁵ In this he differs from the Neo-Pythagoreans, who held that the universe was eternal.

⁶ Cumont holds that the word "catholic" was originally an astrological term, denoting activities which "apply to the whole human race and to the entire earth," and that its use prepared the way for the general acceptance of belief in the unlimited sovereignty of God. Cp. *Astrology and Religion among the Greeks and Romans*, pp. 113-4.

⁷ Cp. 1 Cor. xv. 28.

Now, though this has its origin in the strict monotheism of his own people, and though the Stoic conception is based on another foundation, the Stoic doctrine that the universe was a unity, a well-ordered and harmonious whole, must have impressed St. Paul, and must have seemed to him to be at least suggestive of that more profound truth of the creative sovereignty of God, which was absolute to begin with, which was never really challenged even by the prevalence of sin and depravity, and which was an assured fact of the ultimate destiny of all things.

St. Paul clearly shows the influence of what were originally Chaldean astrological ideas. This is specially shown by what he has to say about "the elements,"¹ "the prince of the power of the air,"² and demons. It was probably mainly through Stoic doctrine that St. Paul was influenced³ in this respect. St. Paul manifestly was familiar with the belief that the homeland of demons was these elements, and specially the air, which constituted, as it were, the kingdom of the chief of the malignant demons. He was also obviously aware that these elements had received a kind of semi-deification.⁴

¹ Cp. Gal. iv. 3, 9; Col. ii. 8, 20. Huart recognises in the popular religion of the Medo-Persian group, the adoration of the four elements (*στοιχεῖα*); cp. *La Perse Antique*, p. 99. Hommel holds that the word *στοιχεῖον* is derived from the three last letters, *σρχ*, of the older Greek alphabet, corresponding to the use of the Hebrew נ . . . נ. He suggests that the Apocalypse was originally in Aramaic, so that Α . . . Ω stands for נ . . . נ. Cp. *Zeitschrift, Für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 1914, Bd. xv. S. 318, n. 319.

² Cp. Eph. ii. 2. Cp. also Rom. viii. 38; Eph. i. 21, vi. 12; Col. ii. 15.

³ The Stoics attributed "a predominating influence to the celestial bodies," and found that their *Εἰμαρμένη*, or destiny, "agreed with the determinism of the Chaldeans, founded, as it was, upon the regularity of the sidereal movements"; cp. Cumont, *Astrology and Religion among the Greeks and Romans*, p. 69. "The influence of Oriental religions, like that of Stoic cosmology, spread throughout the West the worship of those four bodies believed to be elements" (*loc. cit.* p. 121).

⁴ It is an interesting question how far St. Paul was influenced by the belief that reverent contemplation of the heavenly bodies (regarded as being gods) constituted mystical communion with the divine. The mystical element in St. Paul is certainly not altogether Jewish, but also Græco-Oriental. Where he radically differed from Græco-Oriental mysticism was in the subject with whom he had communion, the Risen Lord.

Part of his message, particularly to the Gentile world—a message as emphatic as it was exhilarating—was the proclamation of deliverance from the tyranny of those elements and all malignant demons, through his Crucified, Risen, and Victorious Lord. Alike by His death on the cross, by His descent into Hades¹ to save those who were there, His resurrection, ascension, and presence to His saints as the Spirit, the Lord Jesus Christ has demonstrated, and continues to demonstrate, His victory.²

In common with others, Jew and pagan alike, St. Paul held the view of the world which continued right down through the Middle Ages, namely, that it is the centre of the universe, in a special way the object of the Divine interest,³ and a sphere in which God manifested His presence alike by miracles and by that direct intercourse which was associated with the ecstatic state. It was a world also which was destined to come to a dramatic end.

What were the conditions under which man lived his life in this world? What was the nature of that life? In answering both these questions, St. Paul was no doubt influenced by his pagan environment as truly as he was influenced by traditional Judaism and by Christianity.

For ages the spirit of man had grovelled beneath the depressing tyranny of fate, of necessity. Astrology was

¹ Cp. Eph. iv. 9. Bousset holds that the Christian doctrine of the descent of Christ into Hades is borrowed out of the pagan atmosphere of the times; cp. *Kyrios Christos*, S. 38. Marduk descends into Hades to comfort the imprisoned gods there; cp. "The Legend of Merodach" (*Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology*, 1908, pp. 59 ff.), Pinches. To St. Paul, Satan is not the lord of Hades; cp., however, 1 Cor. xv. 55 (ὁ θάνατος). Cp. 1 Cor. ii. 6-8, Col. ii. 14 f., with 1 Pet. iii. 19.

² Cp. Col. ii. 15.

³ To St. Paul, as to other Christian teachers, that interest of God in the world which dwarfs all others, is the interest revealed in Christ. Holtzmann points out that there is a twofold aspect of God's relationship towards the world: "Das Zunächst in Wirksamkeit tretende, aber untergeordnete, ist der Zorn, das letzte und innerste, allen anderen übergeordnete, die Liebe"; cp. *Neut. Theol.* ii. S. 109.

Böhlig points out that in St. Paul's conception of the cosmos, it is the Aryan sacred numbers 3 and 9 that are used; cp. *Die Geisteskultur von Tarsos*, SS. 84-7. Cp. 2 Cor. xii. 2-4; Rom. x. 6, 7; Eph. ii. 2, iv. 8-10; Phil. ii. 10.

the parent of fatalism. The Chaldeans recognised the all-prevailing domination of necessity throughout the universe.¹ Stoicism, with which St. Paul had a good deal in common, while affirming fatalism, combined that belief with energetic and manly virtue, and, without being strictly consistent, asserted human freedom and moral responsibility.² In the teaching of St. Paul, Divine predestination takes the place of fate ; but, as in the case of the Stoics, St. Paul, nevertheless, finds room alike for personal freedom and moral responsibility,³ and that too in spite of the hampering handicaps of malignant demoniacal influences, the evil heritage of Adam's disobedience, and the flesh as the seat of the passions, and so potentially and actually productive of sin.

Now, in the pagan environment of St. Paul, evil was attributed to various sources—to ignorance, to matter, to deity, to an evil principle. Certainly St. Paul did not regard matter in itself as being evil, for to him it was the creation of God. Nor did he conceive of that God who was ever just, good, and kind, as instigating man to commit sin. But, to St. Paul, there was an intimate association between sin and ignorance. Only through faith could a man know the gospel savingly, and the saving appropriation of the gospel meant to him deliverance from sin. He was at one with contemporary paganism in believing in the malignant influence of at least a certain class of demons ;⁴ and, while he did not consider the

¹ Cp. Cumont, *Astrology and Religion among the Greeks and Romans*, p. 153. The Chaldean view was derived from their study of the regular movements of the celestial bodies.

² Cp. Diog. (Eusebius, *Præp. evang.* vi. 8 ; Cic. *de fato*, 13 ; Diog. Laert. vii. 121 f. ; Seneca, *Epp.* 107. 11.

³ Haering thinks that St. Paul overemphasises the helplessness of the human will as over against the omnipotent will of God and God's grace ; cp. *Ethics of the Christian Life*, p. 79.

⁴ The belief in demons goes far back. It occupied a large place in the religion of the Babylonians. The names given to them indicate such things as "strength," "night-spirit," "seizer," "destroyer." They were forces working for evil, and show themselves in disease, nightmare, insanity, storms, accidents, quarrels. They do not trouble the dead, only the living. They appear as serpents and scorpions,

flesh, when regarded purely as the creation of God, as being evil in itself, he did regard it as the natural seat of those passions which inevitably incited to sin.¹

Alike in his estimate of the depravity of the age, and of the helplessness of man to redeem himself by his own effort, St. Paul is frankly pessimistic. His gloomy outlook was not peculiar to himself. It finds a place in

and attack animals as well as men. Their names are preceded by the same determinative as the names of the gods. The disentombed shade, just like the unburied dead, becomes a demon. An incantation in the British Museum reads :

"O Shamash, a horrible spectre for many days
Hath fastened itself on my back, and will not loose
its hold upon me."

Cp. King, *Babylonian Religion*, p. 201 ; Jastrow, *Religion of Babylonia and Assyria*, pp. 260 ff., 592, 602.

Sacrifice was made to demons. Evidence of this is given by the Hebrew inscribed bowls found at Nuffar ; e.g., an inscribed hen's egg was concealed under one of these bowls. Cp. Hilprecht, *Explorations in Bible Lands*, p. 448.

St. Paul draws a clear distinction between idols and demons. To him, the former were nothing ; but the latter were personal powers, in many cases working for evil. Speaking of the Neo-Pythagoreans, Cumont says that they held "a belief in airy demons who defile and torment mankind" ; cp. *Astrology and Religion among the Greeks and Romans*, p. 87. Cumont also refers to the practice of learning certain formulæ or passwords in order to ensure the safe passage of the liberated soul through the regions of air infested by malevolent demons ; cp. *loc. cit.* p. 193. The difficult problem with which St. Paul had to deal in regard to meat sacrificed to idols (cp. 1 Cor. viii. 1 ff.), had to do with demons. There were two ways believed to be sufficient to prevent evil demoniacal influences : either by securing the aid of the god in overcoming the demon by the sacrifice of meat, or by rendering the person who ate of the food immune by some rite of consecration. Plutarch and the magical papyri present us with abundant information in regard to the popular belief in demons in the first century A.D. ; cp. *de Isid.*, 25, 26, 27 ; *de def. orac.*, 10 ; *Romulus*, 28.

Under demoniacal possession, the ancients classed a number of abnormal states or conditions, whereas modern science recognises four groups, viz. insanity, epilepsy, hysteria major, the mystical state.

¹ According to Epicurus, man is entirely soul and body, the soul being formed out of the finer atoms. According to the Stoics, the human soul is a part of the world soul. It is the fiery breath or heat, which, in intimate association with the blood, gives life and motion. Clemens, while admitting that St. Paul was influenced by Stoicism, says, "His doctrine of the flesh is, in the last resort, distinctively his own" ; cp. *Primitive Christianity*, p. 63. Morgan holds that St. Paul, in his conception of the flesh, passes beyond the Old Testament, and expresses a view which is Hellenistic ; cp. *The Religion and Theology of Paul*, p. 27. In the old astrological religion, "virtue was conceived as liberation from the dominion of the flesh" ; cp. Cumont, *Astrology and Religion among the Greeks and Romans*, p. 191.

the literature of Judaism, and in the literature of paganism.¹ It was characteristic of much of the ancient world to regard the present life as misery, and human existence as being so little desirable that even death became robbed of its terrors.² The Stoics, while deeply conscious of this miserable nature of life, in keeping with their manly courage, refused to regard misfortune as entirely an evil, if for no other reason, because it spurred men on to make the best of their natural powers. While convinced that no mere philosophy, however manly, could save a man, any more than the law of Moses could, this robust spirit of the Stoic must have found sympathetic appreciation in the mind of him who could say, "Work out your own salvation with fear and trembling."³ Appalled St. Paul might be by the prevailing depravity of the times as depicted in Romans,⁴ painfully conscious he might be of the stranglehold which the powers of evil had on the life of the age, overwhelmingly convinced, from his own bitter personal experience, of the inability of the Law to save; but, in St. Paul's mind, there was not the slightest doubt as to the power of Christ to redeem the world, nor as to the moral and spiritual dynamic in the life of every child of the faith. If, in keeping with the spirit of his age, he was a pessimist as regards the ability either of the world or the individual man to save themselves in their own strength, he was the most buoyant of optimists as regards both, if only they could find the way which is Christ.

St. Paul shows himself to be the child of his environ-

¹ e.g. Homer, Herodotus (death is regarded as being better than life, i. 31), Euripides, Menander, the Stoics, the Epicureans, etc. For pessimism as regards the present life and no hope of consolation except in death, cp. *Dialogue with his Soul by the Man weary of Life* (belonging to the third millennium B.C. of ancient Egypt).

² "Even if death is a dreamless sleep," says Socrates in Plato's *Apology*, "it is preferable to life." "Ancient philosophy, therefore, overcame the terrors of death, not by the hope of celestial happiness, but by the knowledge of the small value of earthly existence"; cp. Friedländer, *Roman Life and Manners*, iii. p. 220.

³ Eph. ii. 12.

⁴ Cp. with Rom. i., Eph. ii. 1-3, iv. 17-19, v. 8; 1 Pet. i. 14, ii. 11, iv. 3.

ment, alike by his keen sense of the prevailing depravity,¹ by his sympathy with the widely felt desire for moral betterment and the clean life,² and by a real distinction between those who might be called the morally good and those who might equally well be described as the morally depraved.³ St. Paul did not so much differ from the pagan environment as regards moral ideals and strivings after better things, as rather in his fundamental conception of God, and as regards the means of deliverance from the tyranny of evil. Like the Stoics, he recognises that, in the ethical sphere, there are certain things which may be regarded as indifferent,⁴ and that moral courage and the exercise of self-control are essentials of the moral life;⁵ but he clearly understands, in a way that his pagan contemporaries did not, that man cannot in his own strength secure moral victory, nor can he

¹ Cp. Rom. i, with Tac. *Hist.* i. 2. In regard to the latter, Glover holds that, while Tacitus' remarks do not apply to the whole Roman world, they apply at least to "that half of Rome which gave colour to the thinking of the world"; cp. *The Conflict of Religions*, p. 34. Speaking of St. Paul's time, Dobschütz says, "Divorces were of daily occurrence, adultery common, and unchastity considered no sin," and "The chief tendency of the time, the most impious and most immoral of all religions—Astrology"; cp. *Christian Life in the Primitive Church*, p. 367.

² The demand for an austere life reaches back into very early times, e.g., among the Babylonians and early Greeks. Holy water, running water, sea-water, or water from a sacred fountain were used for purposes of purification. Cp. Cumont, *Astrology and Religion among the Greeks and Romans*, p. 150; Farnell, *Greece and Babylon*, pp. 283-4.

³ The Stoics divided mankind rigidly into the two classes, the good and the bad, the wise and the fools. They recognised no intermediate class between these two extremes. "Der Mensch ist aber entweder tugendhaft oder lasterhaft"; cp. Felten, *Neut. Zeitgesch.* ii. S. 473.

⁴ The Stoics regarded such things as health and sickness, wealth and poverty, as adiaphora. They claimed that all things were permissible to them, even suicide.

⁵ The Stoics held that, by a man's own personal exercise of self-control, it was possible to overcome passion and desire. While many ethical terms were used in common by St. Paul and the Stoics, in two respects there was a fundamental difference. St. Paul, out of the bitterness of his own personal experience as regards the Law, had realised the moral helplessness of man, in a way that the Stoics did not. The personal salvation, which was to be secured by man's own effort, was a thing inconceivable to St. Paul. But, beyond this, while teaching that man's duty was to obey God, Stoicism did not give that clear conception of the nature of God which is necessary to an efficient ethical system.

obtain this without the direct aid of the Personal God as known through Jesus Christ, his Risen Lord. Wherever a man, by the grace of God, had come to realise the truth of these two facts, the spirit of the Stoic, the spirit of manly endeavour and disciplined self-control, would readily contribute towards the furtherance of a life of truly Christian morality. In that respect, St. Paul could look upon Stoicism as, in measure at least, an ally. With Epicurean ethics, on the contrary, he could have nothing in common, even if, under certain conditions, that ethic demanded the exercise of self-restraint.¹

In his conception of mankind as a whole, and duty to man as such, there must have been much in Stoicism which commended itself to the apostle. In this respect, Stoicism passed beyond the tradition of Judaism.² The world-wide humanitarianism of the Stoic had been prepared for by the spread of international religion—that spread which was one of the results of the conquests of Alexander the Great.³ Stoicism was a conciliatory force in the sphere of religion. The Stoic prided himself in being a citizen of the world, charged with a spirit of brotherly love towards all men.⁴ Mutual helpfulness, social service, and self-sacrifice were, according to Stoicism, necessary duties, in view of our common humanity.⁵ Alike in the comprehensiveness of its out-

¹ To the Epicureans, pleasure was the only true good, and, where self-restraint was approved, it was not for the sake of virtue, but to avoid pain.

² While the law of the Jewish code, which enjoins kindness to strangers, is unique among ancient codes, it does not mean that the Israelites cherished a universal love for all men. Cp. Ex. xxii. 21, xxiii. 9; Lev. xix. 10, xxiv. 22; Deut. x. 18-19.

³ Cp. Cumont, *Astrology and Religion among the Greeks and Romans*, pp. 54-5.

⁴ Cp. Friedländer, *Roman Life and Manners*, iii. p. 279; Glover, *The Conflict of Religions*, p. 57.

⁵ Cp. Epict. *Discourses*, Bk. II. x. Seneca, a contemporary of St. Paul, and mainly Stoic in his views, would have slaves regarded as human beings and friends, however humble. There is evidence of the mild treatment of slaves in Babylonia. They were often the confidential business agents of their masters; cp. Jastrow, *Religion of Babylonia and Assyria*, p. 605. Both in Babylonia and Assyria, slaves could own property of their own—lands, houses, other slaves; cp. Delaporte, *Mesopotamia*, p. 271. In Athens of the fifth century

look, and in the energetic and faithful application of the principles involved, there is surely much here that is in direct harmony with the mind and practice of St. Paul, who, breaking through the shackles of Jewish prejudice and the narrowing restraints of the Christian church at Jerusalem, proclaimed Jew and Gentile, bond and free, as one in Christ Jesus, and who could see even in the runaway slave Onesimus, "a brother beloved."¹

Even apart from the Mystery religions, which in this respect, made the richest contribution, men had long been thinking anxiously of the meaning of death, of the relationship of life to death, of immortality and the beyond.² The results of that thinking were embodied

B.C., slaves "were employed in trade and manufacture and lived in the same way as the rest of the population"; cp. Rostovtzeff, *A History of the Ancient World*, p. 289.

¹ Cp. Philemon 16.

² In Egypt, a copy of the Book of the Dead was placed in the graves for the use and guidance of the deceased.

In the Sumerian-Babylonian religion, there is ample evidence of interest in death and immortality, though it is not always possible to harmonise the evidence. Immortality is granted to Ziusudu, according to the Sumerian version of the Deluge:

"Life like (that of) a god he gives to him,
An eternal soul like (that of) a god he creates for him."

Cp. King, *Legends of Babylon and Egypt*, p. 86. In the Semitic version, we find:

"And now let Ut-Napishtim be like the gods, even us."

Cp. King, *Legends of Babylon and Egypt*, p. 90. Similarly also in Berossus's account; cp. Rogers, *Cuneiform Parallels to the Old Testament*, p. 100; cp. Pinches, *Observations sur la religion des Babyloniens*, p. 24 (Babel u. Bibel Pamphlets).

Hilprecht holds that belief in immortality is implied by the burials at Nuffar, going back to at least 4000 B.C., e.g. provision has been made so that the departed might have drinking water; cp. *Explorations in Bible Lands*, p. 456 f. As was first suggested by Hommel, the ziggurat was originally, like the Egyptian pyramid, a sepulchral monument. On an inscription of Ashurbânipal, the ziggurat is called "E-gigumu," i.e. "House of the Tomb"; cp. Hilprecht, *Explorations in Bible Lands*, p. 462.

On the other hand, the appeal to the gods Marduk, Ninib, and Gula as "the restorers of the dead to life" must not be taken literally. What is meant is that these gods can deliver men from deadly diseases, or from the grip of demons, whose grasp would mean death; cp. Jastrow, *Religion of Babylonia and Assyria*, p. 576. Only Adapa of Eridu, and Etana, King of Kish, ascended into the heavens, and neither stayed permanently there; cp. Delaporte, *Mesopotamia*, p. 171; cp. Gunkel, *Israel u. Babylonien*, S. 26.

in the life of St. Paul's environment, and, without doubt, exercised a profound influence on his own views.

With a very great deal of what men believed in regard to these matters, St. Paul, no doubt, would find himself in a state of unqualified opposition. To him, life was the gift of God, a state, brief and uncertain, wherein to do God's will and serve God's purpose in intimate fellowship with the Spirit of Jesus Christ, his Risen Lord. Doing this, there was nothing to fear in death or the beyond, seeing that Christ had overcome death, and was Lord of the world to come. Alike in the terrestrial life, in death, and in the afterwards, the Christian was indissolubly united to his Saviour.

In all this we find his conception different from typical views that may be cited: from Cicero, who taught that faithful service to one's country is the worthiest use of life as it is the sure guarantee of immortality;¹ from the Neo-Pythagoreans, with their doctrine of the transmigration of souls, which implied that the true wages of sin is continued life, life in another state; from the Epicureans, who taught that the wise use of life was the pursuit of pleasure, and that death was in no ways to be feared, because it meant the absolute destruction of existence;² and even from the Stoics, with whom St. Paul has much else in common, because they taught that the true aim of life is not to make ready for death, but to attain to perfect virtue.

When, however, St. Paul portrays life in the body as a miserable state of bondage in which the spirit is meanwhile enthralled,³ and from which it earnestly desires deliverance in order to attain to the glorious freedom of life in the spiritual body, he gives vivid expression to what must have been felt by many of the finer souls of his

¹ "A certain place in heaven is assigned to all who have preserved, or assisted, or improved their country, and there they are to enjoy an endless duration of happiness"; cp. *Dream of Scipio*.

² Cp. Lucret. i. 62 ff., iii. 14 ff., vi. 9 ff. Cp. inscription on a woman's gravestone: "I once was not and am no longer. I know nothing of it; it does not matter to me."

³ Cp. Rom. viii. 23; 2 Cor. v. 2.

pagan environment.¹ St. Paul's conception of physical death, as a stage through which the Christian must pass in order to become fully clothed with the spiritual body, is certainly not altogether Jewish. What helped St. Paul most of all to form it was, no doubt, his own reasoned consideration of the nature of the body of the Risen Lord; but it was a conception which would appeal much more readily to the Gentile than to the Jewish mind, because, in the Gentile world, men had already been groping after some explanation of this kind. The belief in immortality was part of the spiritual atmosphere which the pagan contemporaries of St. Paul breathed.² Ages before, men had lived and died cheered by their visions of the Elysian fields,³ deep down beneath the green sward, or far above in the glittering sky. Men believed that the soul of the good was safely taken by the strong hands of a god,⁴ or carried aloft on the wings of an eagle, to its home among the stars.⁵ No doubt, just as at the present time, there were those who denied, or at least doubted, immortality. This had always been done by

¹ Cp. Cicero, *Dream of Scipio*, who speaks of "this imprisonment in the body."

² According to Hesiod, the men of the Golden Age became "good spirits (*δαίμονες ἐσθλοί*), ranging the earth, watchers of mortal men." Cp. Friedländer: "The souls of the good and just after death act as protecting spirits on earth"; "Those of the bad are condemned to perpetual wandering as larvæ" (*Roman Life and Manners*, iii. p. 304). Farnell holds the view that the "belief in the soul's survival of the body was an ancient heritage of the Hellenic people," and that it must have been much older than the Homeric poems, where it appears; cp. *Greek Hero-Cults and Ideas of Immortality*, p. 3. The Lydian hero Tylon or Tylus, after being killed, was brought to life again; cp. Frazer, *Golden Bough*, Pt. IV., Adonis Attis Osiris, p. 153.

³ Originally the ancient Greeks conceived of the Elysian fields as being located in the depths of the earth, which became in later times the abode of demons and reprobates. Under the influence of astrological religion, the Elysian fields were transferred to the heavens, to the moon, the space between the sun and moon, the Milky Way, or outside the visible heavens. Cp. Cumont, *Astrology and Religion among the Greeks and Romans*, pp. 196-9.

⁴ We remember instinctively the words, "them also which sleep in Jesus," 1 Thess. iv. 14.

⁵ The eagle was peculiarly the bird of the baals, the solar gods. An eagle was fastened to the top of the pyre on which the corpse of a dead Roman Cæsar was burned. It was supposed to carry his spirit aloft.

the Epicureans. But the tradition, handed down from Plato, and held by many of the Stoics,¹ the tradition which accepted immortality as an assured conviction, was the tradition which occupied the field in the pagan environment of St. Paul. The evidence of numerous epitaphs bears this fully out.²

To St. Paul, the communion of the Lord's Supper meant in a special manner direct communion with his Risen Lord, and, through Him, with His saints—not merely with those who were still in the body, but with those who were in His safe keeping on the other side. In this, St. Paul gave more vivid and precise expression to what had long been believed in the pagan world, namely, that mortal men could not merely hold communion with the departed, but could actually share with them in a sacred meal.³ St. Paul's belief in immortality

¹ Panætius and his followers had absolutely denied immortality. Many Stoics, while affirming the survival of the divine fire which glowed in man, believed that it was reabsorbed at death into the universal fire, losing all distinct individuality.

² "As compared with the thousands which betray no doubt in a life after death, the number of materialistic epitaphs is exceedingly small"; cp. Friedländer, *Roman Life and Manners*, iii. p. 285. Whether this applied to the majority of educated people is not capable of proof, but that it applied to the masses is certain; cp. Friedländer, *loc. cit.* p. 296. Speaking of the first century of the Christian era, Felten says: "Wahrscheinlich war aber der Zahl der Leugner der Unsterblichkeit, von der Plutarch sagt, dass sie bei den Griechen eine geringe gewesen sei, auch bei den Römern nicht gross"; cp. *Neutest. Zeitgesch.* ii. S. 503. As examples of the belief expressed by the epitaphs, the following may be cited: "I am waiting for my husband" (epitaph on the grave of a deceased wife); "In this tomb lies the body of a young maiden, flower-bearer of Ceres, carried off by the merciless Fates. But her soul, by the goodwill of the Immortals, dwells among the stars and takes its place in the sacred choir of the blest" (from the epitaph of a girl of thirteen years old discovered in the island of Thasos). The view of Seneca may be taken as typical of a considerable number of the educated class. He believed that, after a process of purification, the souls of the good rose to join the blessed in the ether; cp. *Ad Marciam de consol.* 24.-6, 25. 1, 26. 5, etc.

³ Cp. the Babylonian phrase "breaking bread with" the dead; cp. Farnell, *Greece and Babylon*, p. 209. "In Mesopotamia, as in Hellas, we have clear trace of 'parentalia,' communion-meals to which the ancestral spirits were invited to feast with the family"; cp. Farnell, *loc. cit.* p. 209. "The Hellenic ghost . . . preferred wine and the offerings of blood—the *αἰμακούρια*"; cp. Farnell, *loc. cit.* p. 211. Cp. the *καθέδρα*, "the meal to which the kinsmen sat down together on the thirteenth day after the death"; cp. Farnell, *Greek Hero-Cults and Ideas of Immortality*, p. 353.

was part of the heritage which he received from his own people, the Jews. His conception of the spiritual body, with which all true believers would be furnished in the life to come, his certainty of personal communion and fellowship with his Risen Lord and His saints, were a logical sequel to his conviction that he himself had seen his Exalted Redeemer. There is no need to find a pagan explanation of these beliefs. But, at the same time, alike as regards the belief in personal immortality and the belief in communion with the departed, there was much in St. Paul's pagan environment which would commend itself to him, and make it easier for him to convince his pagan hearers that Christ lived, and that all who believed in Him forthwith became sharers in His death and in His Resurrection life.¹

Not only in regard to his doctrine does St. Paul show the influence of, and points of contact with, his pagan environment, but also in his methods of writing and working. There was a stereotyped phraseology for letter-writing, and a recognised correct method of constructing a letter.² In both these respects, St. Paul shows himself to have been the child of his age. His employment of the commendatory letter, and the allegorical method of interpretation³ were practices of the pagan world in common use.

There was abundant precedent also for his missionary preaching by going from town to town,⁴ though he

¹ It is going too far to say with Morgan that "it was from Hellenistic religion that the conception of a death and resurrection with Christ and of Christ's indwelling entered Christianity"; cp. *The Religion and Theology of Paul*, p. 265.

² Cp. Milligan, *The New Testament Documents*, p. 93; cp. Deissmann, *Light from the Ancient East*, pp. 153 n., 159, for similar practice to St. Paul's "with mine own hand," Col. iv. 18.

³ e.g., the Stoics explained away what was offensive in the traditional legends by means of allegorical interpretation; cp. Cicero, *de Nat. Deorum*, i. 14. 36, 15. 41; iii. 24. 63. As regards letters of commendation, cp. Deissmann, *Light from the Ancient East*, p. 158; Cowley, *Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century*, No. 38, date before 411 B.C.

⁴ With many of these itinerant lecturers St. Paul could have nothing in common. The Cynics, as a rule, were shameless, ignorant,

differed widely from the itinerant pagan preachers alike in his message and in the personal object that he had in view.

The evidence of the inscriptions and papyri shows that many of St. Paul's characteristic words and expressions have a corresponding use in pagan practice. These cover a wide area, and, to take only samples, embrace terms which have to do with religion,¹ magic,² medicine,³ the nature of a Christian as a "brother," a "fellow-heir," and a "freedman of the Lord,"⁴ the congregational collection,⁵ labour,⁶ a woman's love for her husband,⁷ prayer for deliverance

and obscene beggars, justly abhorred by all decent people; cp. Friedländer, *Roman Life and Manners*, iii. p. 247. Hatch describes the Cynics as "the mendicant friars of imperial times"; cp. *The Influence of Greek Ideas and Usages upon the Christian Church*, p. 143. Long before St. Paul's day, the Sophists were itinerant preachers. They resembled St. Paul in the variety of places that they preached in, e.g. the private house, the theatre, the lecture-room. But they differed altogether from him in this, that they were out to win applause and money. For itinerant Orphic missionaries, cp. Eisler, *Orpheus*, p. 2 (they existed from the fifth century B.C. onwards).

¹ e.g. κυριακός, 1 Cor. xi. 20, a word borrowed from contemporary constitutional law, and meaning "imperial"; cp. Deissmann, *Light from the Ancient East*, p. 361 f. σωτήρ, "Saviour," applied to Roman emperors; cp. Deissmann, *op. cit.* p. 369. εὐαγγέλιον, "employed in sacred use in the Imperial cult"; cp. Deissmann, *op. cit.* p. 370. παρουσία, used of the coming or visit of a king or emperor; cp. Deissmann, *op. cit.* pp. 373, 375. There are many "advent" coins; cp. Schubart u. Kuhn, *Papyri u. Ostraka der Ptolemäerzeit*, No. 1233, S. 36.

² Cp. 1 Cor. v. 4, 5, xvi. 22; 1 Tim. i. 20.

³ διαπαγή, "disposition," "ordinance," a medical term, used by astrology, borrowed from contemporary medicine; cp. Deissmann, *op. cit.* p. 86.

⁴ ἀδελφός, συγκαληρονόμος, ἀπελεύθερος κυρίου; cp. Deissmann, *op. cit.* p. 107 ("brother," used as a member of a community), p. 88 ("fellow-heir," on an Ephesian inscription of the Imperial period), p. 382 ("freeman of the emperor").

⁵ λογεία, "collection," 1 Cor. xvi. 1, 2, derived from the verb λογέω, "I collect," and the word itself found in papyri, ostraca, and inscriptions. It is used for a "collection" for a god or temple; cp. Deissmann, *op. cit.* pp. 103 ff.

⁶ "Labour in vain," 1 Cor. xv. 58; Gal. iv. 11; Phil. ii. 16. Cp. Deissmann, *op. cit.* p. 317: these references "are a trembling echo of the discouragement resulting from a width of cloth being rejected as badly woven, and therefore not paid for."

⁷ Cp. Tit. ii. 4, 5, and epitaph at Pergamum; cp. Deissmann, *op. cit.* p. 319.

from affliction,¹ and prayer for others,² debts,³ and law.⁴

Altogether, we have to recognise three formative elements in the fashioning of St. Paul intellectually, religiously, and morally, namely, a Jewish, a Christian, and a Pagan. Of these, the first is to be regarded as the foundation, the second as the chief life and inspiration, the last as the adornment and orientation. The influence of his pagan environment must have acted on St. Paul from his earliest years. Without forgetting that, as a Jewish child, he would be most strictly nurtured, and, in particular, warned against the errors of pagan belief and practice, we can clearly understand that, spending the most impressionable years of his youth in a cosmopolitan city, such as Tarsus was,⁵ he could not fail to ask questions of himself and others as to the meaning of paganism, as to whether there was not, after all, something good in it. When he became a Christian missionary, and had daily intercourse of the most direct nature with pagan beliefs and practices, his interest would be at once increased and deepened. While holding a tenacious grasp, alike of what he believed to be worthy in his ancestral faith, and of the gospel of

¹ Cp. "Concerning the thing, I besought the Lord thrice," 2 Cor. xii. 8, and Deissmann, *op. cit.* p. 311.

² "Making mention of you"; cp. 1 Thess. i. 2; Rom. i. 9; Eph. i. 16; 2 Tim. i. 3; Philem. 4. Cp. for the same phrase, a soldier's letter to his sister; cp. Deissmann, *op. cit.* p. 172.

³ ὀφειλή, "debt," often in papyri. Cp. Deissmann, *op. cit.* pp. 334-5.

⁴ Cp. Deissmann, *op. cit.* pp. 120, 323-41, 361.

⁵ Though it is only in Acts that we have evidence for Tarsus as St. Paul's birthplace, there is no reason for doubting the truth of the tradition. Cp. Acts ix. 30, xi. 25, xxii. 3.

Speaking of the Hellenisation of Tarsus, Farnell says: "No doubt it had penetrated deeply before the period of St. Paul without obliterating vital elements of native religion"; cp. *Greek Hero Cults and Ideas of Immortality*, p. 144. Sandan, the old Hittite deity, who was intimately associated with Tarsus, was identified by the Greeks with their hero-god Herakles, who was at once a warrior of great courage, Σωτήρ "Saviour," a defender against malignant ghosts and diseases, a patron of athletics, and, in later times, the παραστάτης, or "good comrade." One instinctively thinks of St. Paul's conceptions of the Christian warfare, Christ as the Saviour and protector, of the Christian as a spiritual athlete, and the fellowship of the Christian life.

Jesus Christ as he understood it, he recognised that the pagan religions were, in their own way, a seeking after God, that their search had not been altogether in vain, and that for this reason they had something to tell him which must be to his spiritual advantage, even though he was both a Jew and a Christian. In the succeeding chapters, we shall deal further with the influence of paganism on St. Paul, particularly with the influence of the Mystery religions.

CHAPTER II

THE PAGAN ENVIRONMENT

ACCORDING to the views ascribed by tradition to Gamaliel, he was willing to give the novel doctrines of Christianity a fair consideration, suggesting that they might even "be of God."¹ But St. Paul, his pupil, though bred a Pharisee, was prepared to go far beyond this in his spirit of toleration. He frankly admitted himself to be a debtor both to Greek and Barbarian: he was ready to recognise the working of God and goodness in the pagan faiths; and eagerly utilised existing pagan words and ideas in his presentation of the gospel of Jesus Christ.

All the same, St. Paul showed himself in this to be just a singularly intelligent man of the times in which he lived; the heir and inheritor of a long preparation for the mutual understanding of men in religious matters. The identification of deities,² syncretism,³ the fusion of

¹ Acts, v. 39.

² The identification of the gods of one land with those of another was brought into fashion by the conquests of Alexander; cp. Legge, *Forerunners and Rivals of Christianity*, i. p. 17; cp. (however) Rogers, *Cuneiform Parallels to Old Testament*, p. 153, n. 2; cp. King, *Babylonian Religion*, p. 26.

³ Even previous to their contact with the West, the Syrian religions had undergone a process of syncretism; cp. Cumont, *Les Religions orientales*, p. 159. As regards Tarsus, syncretism had been going on for a long time, and particularly marked the Persian period. It was due more to a succession of waves coming from the Orient westwards, than to a movement of Greek thought eastwards. It tended to monotheism, and may be regarded as the parent of the Mysteries. For a very early syncretism, cp. King, *Legends of Babylon and Egypt*, p. 107. For syncretism in early Dynastic Egypt, cp. Moret et Davy, *Des Clans aux empires*, p. 164.

religions, the intimate association of religious beliefs,¹ were facts of long standing.

Particularly important in this respect was the influence of the Orient on the West, of the Greek world on the Roman. That influence, indeed, was not solely religious. It was political (*e.g.* the belief in the divinity, and the divine right, of kings), artistic, literary, philosophical. It had to do with all departments of thought, taste, and feeling.

But, all the same, it was as a religious influence that it exercised the greatest power, and was carried by a vast army of traders, slaves, and mercenary soldiers, who penetrated into the Western lands, to Italy, Gaul, Spain, and other parts of the Occident.

Specially important was the influence of the Syrian religions, which brought with them indirectly certain of the theological doctrines of the Chaldeans.² The Chaldean cosmology dominated completely the syncretistic Syrian cults.³ The highest conception of deity,⁴ reached by these Syrian religions, conceived of God as omnipotent, eternal,⁵ universal, ineffable, present in all nature, and revealing himself most clearly in the splendour of the sun. This conception was appropriated by the West. The eschatology of the Syrian cults also taught the Western world to conceive of God and the pious departed as dwelling in the starry

¹ Speaking of Mithraism and the cult of the Magna Mater, Cumont says: "Les deux religions vécurent en communion intime sur toute l'étendue de l'empire"; cp. *Les Religions orientales*, p. 81.

² Cp. Cumont, *Les Religions orientales*, pp. 149-50. Speaking of the *Λόγια Χαλδαϊκά*, Cumont says: "Il est à la Babylonie ce que la littérature hermétique est à l'Égypte" (p. 150).

³ Cp. Cumont, *Les Religions orientales*, p. 160.

⁴ Because of their exalted conception of deity ("The Most High"), the Syrian cults, owing to the influence of Chaldean astrology, were marked by an attitude of extreme humility towards God. In this they were unlike the Egyptians, who could threaten, and even compel, their gods.

⁵ From the eternal cycle of the sidereal bodies, the astrologers deduced the eternity of deity. God became "le maître d'éternité." "Les prêtres syriens vulgarisèrent dans le monde romain l'idée que Dieu est sans commencement et sans fin"; cp. Cumont, *Les Religions orientales*, p. 157.

heavens.¹ If these conceptions of deity did not embrace all that St. Paul believed, who could deny that they at least paved the way?

Long before the Greeks came into contact with the Romans, they themselves had been influenced and moulded in their religious ideas by others. What we think of as the "Greeks" were themselves a mixed population, produced by the blending of the Indo-Germanic invaders with the native conquered stock, which had already reached a higher level of culture than the invaders by whom that culture was appropriated. This is the view at once of Herodotus and of modern historical research.²

The Olympian religion, which had been gradually evolved, had produced great results. It had debarbarised the worship of the Greek States, worked for harmony and good feeling, evolved a lofty ideal of beauty, produced in Athena the perfect type of wisdom, unremitting labour, and sublime loveliness, and had led to the substitution of allegory for crude mythology.³

The Greek religion was already highly developed before it came into contact with the Latin world. This contact took place at an early date, to the great advantage of the Roman-Italian religion, with which it blended, and which it largely transformed. As early as the end of the third century B.C., this had already taken place.⁴ Not without resistance was this accomplished; but, in the end, Greek religious thought permeated everywhere. Even Cæsar-worship could associate with a Greek cult.⁵

This state of things was possible only because of the

¹ Under the influence of Chaldean astrology, the Syrian cults introduced the doctrine that the Elysian fields were not underground, but in the starry skies.

² Cp. Herodotus, i. 58; cp. Persson, *Arch. für Religionswiss.* Bd. xxi. Hefte 3-4, Der Ursprung der eleusinischen Mysterien, S. 287.

³ Cp. Gilbert Murray, *Four Stages of Greek Religion*, pp. 93-5.

⁴ Cp. Jackson and Lake, *The Beginnings of Christianity*, i. p. 222.

⁵ The Cæsar-Cult was often associated with the cult of Dionysus, e.g. at Ephesus; cp. Poland, *Gesch. des Griech. Vereinswesens*, S. 234; cp. Böhlig, *Die Geisteskultur von Tarsos*, SS. 17, 18.

prevailing spirit of religious toleration.¹ As a general rule, such a spirit of toleration towards the native religions prevailed in the provinces, both in the time of the Republic and under the Empire. There were, of course, for political and economic reasons, exceptions.² Augustus, as the restorer of the traditional Roman faith, was opposed to the recognition of the Alexandrian deities, *i.e.* to the deities of what had been a hostile power, and Tiberius followed his policy.

Now while St. Paul clearly recognised at once the error and the degradation of polytheism, he, at the same

¹ The spirit of toleration (though there were many exceptions) had long been in the world. In Babylonia, toleration was extended to other cults, when once the unquestioned supremacy of Marduk was established; cp. Jastrow, *Religion of Babylonia and Assyria*, p. 601. Toleration was the policy adopted by the Persian Empire towards subject peoples. This spirit was due to the nature of the Persian religion. In the great empire founded by Cyrus, and consolidated by Darius I., the subject peoples were each allowed to retain their own particular religion. Proselytising was not the policy of the Persian Empire. Persian kings were even prepared to appropriate to themselves the faiths of the conquered races. The toleration of the Persians helped largely to produce the syncretism out of which the universal religions have sprung, with the conceptions of One God, one morality for mankind, the idea of humanity. Cp. Huart, *La Perse antique*, pp. x, xii (Avant-Propos, by Berr), p. 96; Rostovtzeff, *A History of the Ancient World*, pp. 151 ff.

² *e.g.*, Druidism (cp. Pliny, *H.N.* xxx. 4), the cult of Saturn in Africa (cp. Tert. *Apol.* 9). In both cases human sacrifice was objected to.

The Jews were intolerant. Even though they had long had intimate religious associations with those Gentiles who had become proselytes, this would not make them more tolerant towards Gentiles who were still pagans. St. Paul was badly treated by them on several occasions (*e.g.* Acts xiii. 50, xiv. 2, etc.). Tertullian called the synagogues, "fontes persecutionum."

To the Jews the Christians were "a godless sect," αἵρεσιν ἀθεον; cp. Justin, *Dial.* xvii. Eusebius tells us how the doctrine of Christ was described by the Jews as "a novel heresy estranged from God" (τὴν Χριστοῦ διδασκαλίαν ὡς αἵρεσιν καινὴν καὶ ἀλλοτρίαν τοῦ θεοῦ); cp. Isa. xviii. 1 f.

St. Paul suffered persecution at the hands of pagans; but it was for economic, rather than religious reasons (*e.g.* Acts xvi. 16 ff., xix. 24 ff.; 1 Thess. ii. 2).

Initiates of the Eleusinian Mysteries were at liberty to take part in the rites of other local cults; cp. Rohde, *Psyche*, i. S. 300.

The first Oriental cult adopted by the Romans was that of the Magna Mater deum Idea. During the war against Mithridates, Roman soldiers paid homage to Ma; cp. Cumont, *Les Religions orientales*, pp. 57, 67. After some resistance, the cult of Isis was authorised under Caligula, and the cult of Cybele and Attis under Claudius.

time, frankly appreciated the good in the pagan faiths, e.g. this spirit of toleration. The real cause of the persecution of Christianity was not want of toleration on the part of paganism, nor even the hostility of the Christian religion to the pagan faiths; but the opposition of Christianity to the worship of the emperors.¹

Granted that Judaism was the chief formative element in the earlier days of St. Paul's life, he could not thereby escape the influence of paganism. Long before he was born, Judaism had influenced, and been influenced by, pagan beliefs. There is evidence of mutual interaction in the case of the Egyptian and the Jewish religions. The magic papyri reveal the presence of such names as *Iáw*, *'Aδωνáĩ*, Abraham, Jacob, Moses, etc.² Cumont finds that the influence of Judaism on the Phrygian god Sabazius is certain.³ He thinks also that Judaism had an influence on the religion of Cybele.⁴ Jewish thought was probably moulded by the Mithraic antagonism between the personified powers of good and evil.⁵

To the Romans, Judaism did not seem to be a system of doctrine or a philosophy, but a group of religious and

¹ Cp. Harnack, *The Expansion of Christianity*, i. p. 372; cp. Ramsay, *Pictures of the Apostolic Church*, pp. 253-4. "It was the religion of the Cæsars, not the religion of Jupiter and Artemis, that first felt the new religion to be the enemy" (Ramsay, *Expositor*, vol. ii. Fourth Series, p. 15 n.).

² Cp. Dieterich, in his edition of the *Μοῦς ἡ Ὁγδοὴ Μωϋσέως*, p. 201 ff.; cp. Origen, *c. Celsum*, iv. 33, showing that in the use of magic formulæ, the name of the "God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob" was used, not merely by Jews, but by nearly all. "Die Geschichte des Zaubers lehrt uns am besten, wie stark das Judentum von dem umgebenden Heidentum beeinflusst wurde, sie lehrt aber auch, wie viel von diesen Einflüssen, zum Teil durch die Vermittlung des Judentums, auf das Empfinden der breiteren christlichen Volksschichten weiter wirkte"; cp. Reitzenstein, *Poimandres*, S. 303.

³ "Cette vieille divinité des tribus thraco-phrygiennes fut, par une audacieuse étymologie qui remonte à l'époque hellénistique, identifiée avec le 'Iahwé Zebaoth,' le Dieu des armées, de la Bible"; cp. *Les Religions orientales*, p. 79.

⁴ Cp. *ibid.* p. 80.

⁵ *Ibid.* p. 186. In the system of Simon Magus there is a clumsy fusion of Orphic cosmogony with the Mosaic creation; cp. *The Great Announcement*.

moral customs and laws.¹ The Romans were singularly favourable to the Jews, and could not fail to be influenced by Jewish life and practice. We may be equally certain that, during their long sojourn in the great cities of the Roman empire, the Jews had been considerably moulded and modified in their religious and moral outlook by Roman ideas and ideals. In this way we may conclude that St. Paul had a certain heritage of pagan origin through his ancestral Judaism.

Perhaps it is going too far to say that, without the genius and the life-work of St. Paul, Christianity would never have become a world-religion; but it is certainly true that no mere man contributed so greatly to this as he did.² Christianity, as a world-religion, had to take account of the pagan religions. Its success or failure in winning the world to Christ would largely depend upon the wisdom and sympathy of its attitude towards those pagan faiths. From the first, Christianity felt itself to be something, not only new,³ but better than anything that men had hitherto known in religion. It had at once to make its own position clear, and to try to understand alike the pagan and the Jewish worlds with which it came into contact.

As over against the pagan world in general (there were, of course, exceptions), the Christians stood on the foundation of the One Living and True God, whose Will was superior to all fate, who was just yet merciful. As over against Judaism, they affirmed their unfaltering belief in Jesus Christ, the Son of God, Incarnate, Crucified for our deliverance from sin, Risen, the centre of the Cosmos, coming again in power, the Christ who

¹ Cp. Juster, *Les Juifs dans l'empire romain*, p. 244.

² "Er [Paul] war der erste, der die Weltbedeutung der neuen Religion klar erkannte"; cp. Lueken, *H. C. Philipper*, S. 383.

³ When men say, as Carpenter does, that "the main Christian doctrines and festivals, besides a great mass of affiliated legend and ceremonial, are really quite directly derived from, and related to, preceding Nature worships," they show at once a singular misunderstanding of paganism and of the genius of Christianity; cp. *Pagan and Christian Creeds*, p. 19.

had already been revealing Himself in the Old Testament, as truly as He was the Holy Spirit living in the Christian Church and in the redeemed heart of the individual Christian.

The Primitive Christian Church ran a twofold risk when it conceived of the "saint" as one completely separated from the profane world,¹ and when it took the narrow-minded and embittered view of the pagan world which we find in the Apocalypse of St. John. Later on, the Christian apologists were grossly unfair to paganism, for they often attacked not contemporary pagan beliefs, but rather the errors embodied in the pagan literature of much earlier times. This spirit has continued in much of modern missionary work, and has hindered the spread of the gospel.²

Now no one had a clearer or firmer grasp of the true nature of saintliness than St. Paul; but the saints, just because they were saints, had laid upon them the pressing duty to be in the world in order to win that world to Christ. And his attitude towards paganism, so far from being one of unqualified hostility, must rather be understood as one of sympathetic understanding. The pagan belief in heroes could hardly fail to influence a man like St. Paul. The fact that these were thought of as men who had died after living lives of noble service, and who, as a reward for this, now dwelt with the gods, and in measure were even endowed with the powers of the gods,³ the fact that they were specially helpful in times of sickness, and afforded intimation of the future,⁴ could hardly fail to prepare, if even unconsciously, the mind of St. Paul for the whole-hearted acceptance of Jesus Christ, once man, dead, risen, exalted, endowed with divine power which operated upon His followers on earth. It has to be remembered that, even in the time

¹ Cp. Holtzmann, *Neut. Theol.* ii. S. 168.

² "Ainsi la polémique chrétienne nous donnerait souvent une idée inadéquate du paganisme à son déclin"; cp. Cumont, *Les Religions orientales*, p. 245; cp. Marett, *Anthropology*, p. 19.

³ Cp. Rohde, *Psyche*, i. S. 150.

⁴ Cp. *ibid.* i. 184.

of Augustus, Tarsus had exalted Athenodorus to the rank of a hero.¹

We think of St. Paul as one who had the breadth of outlook to understand paganism, to appreciate what was best in it,² and as one who, in turn, could be understood by paganism, even when paganism did not accept his gospel.³ Without abandoning what he felt to be permanent, that is divine, in his inherited Judaism, and certainly remaining true to his understanding of the gospel of his Risen Lord, St. Paul, at the same time, owed a debt that cannot be measured to Hellenism.⁴

It cannot be said that St. Paul was more pagan than Christian, any more than it could be said that he was more pagan than Jew.⁵ What is true is rather this, that St. Paul's theology was essentially and fundamentally Christian, bore the marks alike of his Jewish heredity,⁶ tradition, and training, and was, at the same time, moulded and toned by the influence of his pagan environment. Even the Gnostic ideas in certain of St. Paul's

¹ Cp. *ibid.* ii. 356; cp. Böhlig, *Die Geisteskultur von Tarsos*, SS. 110 n. 1, 115 ff.

² Cp. Deissmann, *Light from the Ancient East*, pp. 282, 314.

³ Lewis Campbell points out that Plutarch would have readily understood St. Paul's words, "The things which the Gentiles sacrifice, they sacrifice to demons and not to God"; cp. *Religion in Greek Literature*, p. 375.

⁴ "Mag unendlich viel in seinem Empfinden und Denken jüdisch geblieben sein, dem Hellenismus verdankt er den Glauben an sein Apostolat und seine Freiheit"; cp. Reitzenstein, *Die Hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen*, S. 60; cp. Bousset, *Kyrios Christos*, S. xvii; cp. Weiss, *Das Urchristentum*, S. 511.

⁵ Kohler says that St. Paul's theological system is "far more pagan than Jewish in type" (for example, original sin, and Christ's death as an "atoning sacrifice offered by God Himself"); cp. *Jewish Theology*, p. 437. According to Kohler, "the one essential for salvation (according to St. Paul) was to accept the mystery concerning the birth and death of Christ, after the manner of the heathen mystery religions, and to employ as sacramental symbols of the mystery the rites of baptism and communion with Christ"; cp. *Jewish Theology*, p. 438.

Kohler holds that St. Paul's teaching, being antinomian, is contrary to that of Jesus' sermon on the mount; cp. *Jewish Theology*, p. 439.

⁶ Both directly and indirectly, St. Paul is always mindful of his Jewish descent. "So bezeichnet vielleicht γένος, sicher aber συγγενής bei Paulus die zugehörigkeit des Apostels zu seinen Stammes-genossen und zwar in Röm. 16 zu denen in Tarsos und Röm. 9 zu den jüdischen Stammesgenossen überhaupt"; cp. Böhlig, *Die Geisteskultur von Tarsos*, S. 144.

writings are a witness to this last. Formerly, and erroneously, these were supposed to indicate a late date of composition. Now we know that their presence is due to the influence of pre-Christian Gnosticism, a Gnosticism which was Oriental and eclectic, dualistic and pessimistic.¹

Paganism was neither St. Paul's sole nor principal teacher as regards the Being and Nature of God. Judaism and Christianity were his chief teachers in this respect. But, at the same time, St. Paul's intercourse with paganism must have helped him to realise with a larger outlook the beneficent activity of God, and afforded him further confirmation of the conception of deity which he already held. Later on in this book, we shall give fuller illustration of the influence of the pagan ideas of God on the mind of St. Paul: here we shall present one or two of the salient features.

The conviction that God was One was not the exclusive discovery either of Judaism or Christianity. It had been reached by paganism independently and long before St. Paul's day. It was the belief of Plato. Orphism had done a great service in teaching men "that all their national and local deities were but different forms of one great Power, who was Himself the source of all being."² Paganism believed as firmly as Judaism that God spoke directly to mortal men.³ It was not merely the prophets and seers of Israel who could claim this privilege. Paganism had glimpsed the deeper and even unsearchable things behind all that men call their gods. It felt that there were always unexplored

¹ Cp. Lake, *The Earlier Epistles of St. Paul*, pp. 46-7. Speaking of pre-Christian Gnosticism, Bousset says: "Der Grundzug an dem Charakter dieser Bewegung ist ein schroffer Dualismus und ein damit eng verbundener radikaler Pessimismus gegenüber dieser niederen natürlichen Welt"; cp. *Kyrios Christos*, S. 222.

² Cp. Legge, *Forerunners and Rivals of Christianity*, i. p. 145. According to a Lydian inscription, "There is one God in the heavens, great Mên the heavenly, the great power of the ever-living God"; cp. Keil and Premerstein, *Reise in Lydien*, ii. S. 110.

³ *e.g.*, it was the god himself who was believed to speak directly from the lips of the priestess of Apollo; cp. Rohde, *Psyche*, ii. S. 61.

and perhaps unexplorable reserves of the Divine.¹ All this finds a place in the theology of St. Paul.

Then there had been what one might call a negative preparation in paganism. Even Euripides had thrown doubts on the reality of the existence of the gods.² The time had long come when men had been forced to recognise the failure of the Olympian gods. In Cicero's day, not only were the temples neglected, but the theft of statues and other temple property was common.³ In despair men turned to the worship of fortune or fate,⁴ and to the comfort of the Mystery religions. In this way the ground had been prepared for St. Paul's message, and an opportunity for the furtherance of the gospel provided.

The environment in which a man spends the most impressionable years of his life leaves an indelible mark upon his character. It is therefore highly important that we should get a true estimate of the influence of Tarsus in the making of St. Paul.⁵ We do not know

¹ Speaking of the Olympian religion, Gilbert Murray has said: "The god himself . . . was not the reality, but only a symbol to help towards conceiving the reality"; cp. *Four Stages of Greek Religion*, p. 99; cp. Norden, *Agnostos Theos.*; cp. Weinreich, "De dis ignotis quaestiones selectae," *Arch. für Religionswiss.* Bd. xviii. (1915).

In the Babylonian Wisdom literature, the so-called Babylonian Job, Tabi-utul-Bêl, asks, "Who can understand the counsel of the gods?" l. 36 (Rogers, *Cuneiform Parallels to the Old Testament*, p. 167). In the Babylonian religion, it was through his suffering that a man was made aware of the fact that he had sinned against some god. The god is therefore spoken of as the "unknown god" or the "unknown goddess": "O that the god who is unknown be pacified" (from one of the Penitential Psalms); cp. Jastrow, *Religion of Babylonia and Assyria*, p. 320.

² "And I know of small States, where the gods are honoured, that are overmastered in battle by numbers and become subject to greater States that are far less god-fearing"; cp. Bellerophon, *Frag.* 286; cp. I Cor. viii. 4.

³ Cp. Warde Fowler, *Social Life at Rome in the Age of Cicero*, p. 321; cp. Grenier, *Le Génie romain*, p. 438.

⁴ Cp. Murray, *Four Stages of Greek Religion*, p. 116.

⁵ "Demnach ist nicht Jerusalem, sondern Tarsos und überhaupt die Diaspora, die Heimstätte der jüdischen Gedanken Pauli"; cp. Böhlig, *Die Geisteskultur von Tarsos*, SS. 166-7. Though Acts is our only first-rate authority for his connection with Tarsus, there seems to be no reason to doubt its reliability in this respect. St. Paul probably possessed the citizenship of Tarsus, as well as Roman citizenship; cp. Acts xxi. 39.

how long St. Paul's family had been settled there, though the presumption is that it had been there for some time. What we do know is that Jews had been settled in Tarsus for more than a century and a half.¹ They had had plenty of time to drink in the atmosphere of the place, and though St. Paul's antecedents may have arrived much later, they would quickly become moulded in their outlook by the spirit of their fellow-Jews already settled there. We may reasonably expect that Tarsus in some way should show its influence on the ideas of St. Paul.

The peculiar interest in athletics, which we find so marked in his writings, at once arrests our attention, when we remember that Sandan or Herakles was the chief god of his native city. It seems impossible to find the source of this interest elsewhere. It could not be derived from the Old Testament, which is certainly not an athletic book. Nor, admitting that he was a Pharisee,² could that be the origin. It cannot be explained by his rabbinical training, by anything that existed in the life of the primitive Jewish church, nor by his conversion.

We must look for the explanation of it in the pagan environment of his boyhood. By his interest in athletics, St. Paul showed himself to have the spirit and the prejudice of the Greek provincial towns, which, in this respect, differed markedly from Rome.³ Herakles, like

¹ Ramsay thinks that there were Jews in Tarsus from 171 B.C.; cp. *The Cities of St. Paul*, i. pp. 169 ff.; cp. Juster, *Les Juifs dans l'empire romain*, p. 193 n. 2. The Romans recognised the Jewish religion because, unlike Christianity, it was a national faith. A succession of emperors delighted to confer and confirm their special privileges. The Jews had a preference for being under Roman rule. When a Jew became a Roman citizen, he lost certain of his privileges as a Jew, but gained others, and must, as in the case of St. Paul, have been brought more closely and sympathetically in touch with Roman ways; cp. Juster, *Les Juifs dans l'empire romain*, i. pp. 215 ff., 342 ff. ii. pp. 15 ff.; cp. Böhlig, *Die Geisteskultur von Tarsos*, S. 129.

² Windisch holds that when St. Paul is said to declare himself to be a Pharisee (Acts xxiii. 6), this "can hardly be considered historical. . . . For it implies hypocrisy on the part of Paul." Cp. Jackson and Lake, *Beginnings of Christianity*, pt. i. vol. ii. p. 333. But cp. Phil. iii. 5.

³ Up to the time of Nero and Domitian, the Romans were hostile to the Greek type of athlete, and spoke of them with disdain; cp. Friedländer, *Roman Life and Manners*, pp. 122 ff.

Hermes, with whom he was frequently associated in the Greek cities, was a god of athletics and the palaestra.¹ Is it not more than probable that it is in Sandan-Herakles that we find the source of St. Paul's marked interest in athletics?

But an even greater debt is to be traced to the same source. The symbolic representation of the death of Sandan, which was probably followed by a ceremony of his resurrection,² scenes regularly enacted in Tarsus, no doubt, prepared the mind of the young St. Paul for the acceptance of faith in the Christ who died, rose again, and was exalted as the Risen Lord. To the Greeks, Herakles was the earliest and most striking example of a mere man who, through labour and pain, won divinity.³

Alike in his conception of the unseen and the seen world, St. Paul reveals in his thought the influence of paganism. Just as in the case of the Neo-Platonists, his

¹ Cp. Farnell, *Greek Hero Cults and Ideas of Immortality*, p. 154; cp. οἱ συνήθ[εις] τοῦ Ἡρακλέος (Thessalonica); cp. 1 Cor. viii. 7; οἱ περὶ τὸν Ἡρακλέα (ἀθληταί); cp. Poland, *Gesch. des Griech. Vereinswesens*, SS. 69, 70 n., 204.

² Cp. Frazer, *The Golden Bough*, pt. iv., Adonis, Attis, Osiris, pp. 98 ff. (Frazer says, however, that there is "no direct evidence" of that resurrection.) For coins apparently depicting the burning of Sandan, cp. Müller, *Sandan and Sardanapal*, *Kleine Schriften*, ii. p. 100.

³ Cp. Farnell, *Greek Cults and Ideas of Immortality*, p. 154. According to Miss Harrison, Herakles probably means "the young dear hero, the hero par excellence"; cp. *Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Religion*, p. 347.

The deification of kings goes back to a very early date in Babylonia. According to Clay, Tammuz was originally a king of Babylonia, and the lover of Ashirta (*i.e.* Ishtar), Queen of Aleppo. Tammuz, while hunting with Ashirta in a wooded gorge, was killed. A great shrine was erected over the spot where his mangled body was buried, and his cult was inaugurated by Ashirta; cp. *The Origin of Biblical Traditions*, p. 26.

On the obelisk of Manishtusu, we find "Sharru-kin-ili," *i.e.* "Sargon is my god." Narâm-Sin was called the "god of Agade" during his lifetime; cp. Delaporte, *Mesopotamia*, pp. 65, 143.

Dungi and Gudea, in the tablets immediately after their reign, have the determinative that is placed before the names of the gods; cp. Jastrow, *Religion of Babylonia and Assyria*, p. 561; cp. Delaporte, *Mesopotamia*, pp. 33-35. Gimil-Sin was deified during his lifetime. Hammurabi took the title Hammurabi-ilu (*i.e.* "Hammurabi is god"); cp. Delaporte, *Mesopotamia*, p. 65.

In Egypt, Pharaohs of the Fourth Dynasty were deified; cp. Moret et Davy, *Des Clans aux empires*, p. 210.

theory of demons is to be traced back to the Persian religion.¹ His classification of good angels and wicked demons implies pagan influence.²

As regards the seen world, St. Paul's conception was at once pagan, Jewish, and Christian.³ The conception of the four elements, of which it is composed, is pagan. These were an essential part of St. Paul's physics.⁴

In the history of Judaism we find a twofold tradition. According to the first, which was on the whole friendly to the pagan world, mankind was one, inasmuch as all were children of Adam. Even when, later on, Israel was felt to be a peculiar people, the rest of humanity was not necessarily outcast from God. And, in keeping with this, and as the logical outcome of the growing belief in the One God, there arose a more matured conviction of the essential unity of mankind. In contradiction to this, however, there was the belief that the Gentile world was under the rule of Satan and inevitably doomed to perish in the flames of Gehenna.⁵

Now, when St. Paul thinks of the world as God's creation,⁶ he is using the term in a sense common to Jew and Greek, and similarly when he employs it in the sense

¹ Cp. Porphyry, *de abstin.* ii. 37-43; *de regressu animae* (Aug. *Civ. Dei.* x. 9); cp. Iamblichus (*de mysteriis*, iii. 31); cp. Cumont, *Les Religions orientales*, p. 184.

² It is noteworthy that St. Paul's angels are so often bad; cp. 1 Cor. ii. 8, vi. 3, xv. 24 ff.; 2 Cor. xii. 7; Rom. viii. 38; Col. ii. 15, etc.

³ St. Paul conceived of the physical world as a cosmos, an orderly world regulated by physical law. This was a discovery of the Greek mind; cp. Glover, *Progress in Religion*, p. 169. St. Paul's conception of the moral law was part of his direct heritage from Judaism; but we have to remember that the code of Hammurabi was in existence long before the time of Moses. His attitude towards the ceremonial law is somewhat difficult to define. Windisch thinks that when he lived among Jews, St. Paul possibly observed the ceremonial law; cp. Jackson and Lake, *The Beginnings of Christianity*, pt. i. vol. ii. In any case, his conception of ceremonial law was originally Jewish, and subsequently modified by his Christian outlook.

⁴ Time, which was originally altogether a religious conception, was explainable by the interplay of these elements. Festival days and even the Sabbath are to be regarded as relics of this primitive conception; cp. Cumont, *Les Religions orientales*, p. 212.

⁵ Cp. Kohler, *Jewish Theology*, p. 401.

⁶ Cp. Rom. i. 20, viii. 19 ff.; Col. i. 15. Cp. for distinctive Greek sense, Gal. iv. 3; Col. ii. 8, 20.

of mankind.¹ When he understands by the term, "the heathen world," the use is Jewish.² When he uses it as meaning the sum-total of all spiritual existence,³ he is following the Stoic use. When he means by the word the civilised world,⁴ or the world of goods and values,⁵ he is following common uses of the pagan world.

Altogether alien to his mind was the Jewish view which regarded the pagan world as utterly bad and inevitably doomed to destruction. Had this not been so, he could not have been the apostle of Christ to the Gentile world, to win that world to Him. To St. Paul, the most significant meaning of the world is the world from which men are redeemed by Christ, the world which has to be reconciled to God through Jesus Christ, the Risen Lord.⁶

St. Paul's view of the spiritual state of the world, of the age in which he lived, was gloomy, hopeless, except for the power which lay in the gospel to redeem it. The world had not the strength in itself to find a way of deliverance. It had lost confidence in itself. Its nerve had failed.⁷

This view of St. Paul was, however, by no means original. It was a traditional belief,⁸ it was in the atmo-

¹ Cp. 1 Cor. v. 10, xiv. 10; 2 Cor. i. 12; Rom. iii. 6, 19, v. 12.

² Cp. 1 Cor. i. 21, 27 f., iv. 13, vi. 2, xi. 32; 2 Cor. v. 19; Rom. xi. 12, 15.

³ Cp. 1 Cor. iv. 9; Phil. ii. 10; Col. i. 16.

⁴ Cp. Rom. i. 8, x. 18.

⁵ Cp. 1 Cor. vii. 31, 33; 2 Cor. vii. 10; Rom. xii. 2.

⁶ Cp. Gal. i. 4, vi. 14; Col. ii. 20.

⁷ Cp. Murray, *Four Stages of Greek Religion*, pp. 103 ff.

⁸ According to Hesiod, there was first of all the Golden Age, when Cronos was king of heaven. The shades of the men of this age are now the good spirits and guardians of living men. Then came the Silver Age. The shades of the men belonging to it, though inferior to their predecessors, are now "the blessed ones of the underworld." Next came the Bronze Age, which bred a race of terrible men. Thereafter the Age of Heroes, who now dwell in the "islands of the blest." The fifth, or Iron Age, is an age of evil, of self-seeking and treachery; cp. *Works and Days*, p. 109. "To the ancients all history was a progress towards decay, a degradation from good to bad"; cp. Ramsay, *The Bearing of Recent Discovery on the Trustworthiness of the New Testament*, p. 344. Ramsay points out that Horace, in his sixteenth epode, and in the second ode of the first book, gives a view of the hopeless state of the world resembling that held by St. Paul; cp. *op. cit.* pp. 323 ff.

sphere which he breathed. It is the view embodied in the Hermetic literature, which, in its original form, we may be certain, was at least contemporary with St. Paul, and it is remarkable that, in that same literature, in the form in which it has survived, we find an anticipation of deliverance from the existing degradation and hopeless outlook.¹ The difference between the Pauline and the Hermetic means of deliverance was one partly of origin and partly of efficiency to accomplish the herculean task.

St. Paul as a Christian apostle had to use pagan means and methods, just because they were the means and methods which prevailed in the environment in which he did his life's work. We have to think of him as an eager student always at school, the school of pagan life and thought, a school which he had not only to attend, but which he delighted to be a pupil of.

In two main ways the lessons of paganism came to him. On the one hand, from those who were still outside the Christian Church, and, on the other, from the growing numbers of those who were now within, and who, Christian as they were, had brought, and in measure would always retain, their pagan heritage.

It was with the poorer classes of the pagan world that St. Paul mainly came into contact. This was natural, alike because of his own low social status, and because they were the only classes that he had access to. Fortunately, they were the people most likely to accept his message. Had he been able to approach the upper classes, he would have found them difficult, because they

¹ "The sorrowful departure of the gods from men takes place; bad angels only stay, who, mingled with humanity, will lay their hands on them, and drive the wretched folk to every ill of recklessness—to wars and robberies, deceits, and all those things that are opposed to the soul's nature; cp. The Perfect Sermon, xxv. § 4; Mead, *Thrice-Greatest Hermes*, ii. p. 355. The state depicted is "the world's old age"; cp. *op. cit.* xxvi. § 1, p. 356. This period will be followed by a time of restoration by God: "For this [re]birth of Cosmos is the making new of all good things, and the most holy and most pious bringing back again of Nature's self"; cp. *op. cit.* xxvi. § 2, p. 357. "The world of Good is His (God's) Image"; cp. *op. cit.* xxvi. § 3, p. 358.

were generally marked by a spirit of scepticism.¹ The poorer classes were also readier to give welcome to the Christian doctrine and practice of love and helpfulness.² They are always the people who need these most.

By becoming a Christian, a man did not cease to be a student in the school of paganism. A certain amount of social intercourse with pagans was permitted. In this respect, the Christians, at least the Gentile Christians, differed from the Jews. These latter, through their business dealings with the Gentiles, were naturally compelled to come into contact with them. But the Jew was essentially a man apart from the rest of humanity. With the Christian it was different. Many of them had been pagans, and a man cannot, either by a change of his political or religious views, entirely break with his past. It would be a serious loss to him if he did so.

So long as the Christian did not do anything to offend his own conscience, anything that meant a betrayal of his Lord, anything that would hurt a Christian brother, or put an obstacle in the way of his pagan friends which might prevent them from becoming Christian, he was free to have social intercourse with pagans. Clearly it was to be to the advantage of the spread of the gospel, that Christians should keep on friendly terms with pagans, and should make a good impression on them. Mixed marriages were forbidden.³ But where husband or wife became Christian, the marriage tie was not to be severed.⁴ And, in any case, the children of mixed marriages were to be regarded as holy.⁵ Christians must avoid the pagan law courts. St. Paul wished the Christians to have nothing to do with these. It was better even to allow oneself to be wronged.⁶ Apart from

¹ Cp. Duchesne, *Histoire ancienne de l'Eglise*, i. p. 7.

² The Stoics had long taught that "to love and help humanity is the work and very essence of God"; cp. Murray, *Four Stages of Greek Religion*, p. 139.

³ Cp. 2 Cor. vi. 14 ff.

⁵ Cp. 1 Cor. vii. 12-17.

⁴ Cp. 1 Cor. vii. 39.

⁶ Cp. 1 Cor. vi. 1 ff.

these necessary restrictions, the Christians were free, and even encouraged, to associate with pagans.

In nothing does the genius of St. Paul shine forth more brilliantly than in this, that he decided to carry his gospel to the pagan world,¹ and, alike from the Gentiles still outside, and from those who had come into the fold, St. Paul continued to learn. As regards the latter, there was abundant opportunity. Some of his most intimate and valuable personal friends were Gentiles.² Some of his churches were altogether or almost entirely of Gentile origin,³ some of them were largely so.⁴ It may be that, in at least one case, a part of the church, hitherto regarded as Jewish, was in reality Gentile.⁵ These Gentiles brought with them into the Christian Church a rich store of pagan lore and belief. When they became Christian, that, no doubt, meant that they recognised the superiority of the Christian faith to what they had hitherto believed. It meant also a break, more or less, with their past beliefs and practices. But, inasmuch as all that paganism of the former days had not been altogether alien to the mind of God, and inasmuch as there must have been in any case a great deal of re-adjustment of views, St. Paul must continually have had to deal with doctrines and practices of paganism which could hardly fail to influence and even to modify his own religious outlook.

Religious terms and religious conceptions are always inseparable. Through daily contact with the former, St. Paul could not fail to become increasingly familiar

¹ "Der grosse und entscheidende Einschnitt in die Entwicklung des Christentums ist durch seinen Übertritt auf heidenchristliches Gebiet in seinen allerersten Anfängen markiert"; cp. Bousset, *Kyrios Christos*, S. vi.

² e.g. Aristarchus, the Thessalonian.

³ e.g. the Galatian and Thessalonian churches.

⁴ e.g. the Corinthian church; cp. 1 Cor. xii. 2.

⁵ According to Wetter, the original narrative of the Pentecost (Acts ii. 1 ff.) has to do with Gentile Christians. This is shown by the Holy Spirit and the gifts of the Spirit being the centre of the religious life. He regards Ἰουδαῖοι (v. 5) as a gloss; cp. *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft*, Bd. xxi. Hefte 3-4, "Das älteste hellenistische Christentum nach der Apostelgeschichte," SS. 405 ff.

with the latter. It was not an empty world, so far as pagan religious life and thought were concerned, that St. Paul found himself in. Religious ideas, right or wrong, had embedded themselves in the life of the world in which St. Paul lived, and religion, then as now, was a matter of life and death to great multitudes of earnest people. Big-hearted, large-minded men, like the apostle, will always respect the sincere beliefs of others, even when they reluctantly recognise that these beliefs are in measure inadequate or even erroneous. St. Paul was the tireless student, ever ready to learn from any one who could teach him, ever willing to give a fair hearing to others, however divergent their views. He both discerned and rejoiced in the undoubted truth that was in paganism.

Alike his psychology and his speech were already the possession of the human environment into which he was born.¹ Just as he wore the customary garments of his age,² so he spoke the Greek tongue, the "Koine,"³ the speech common to the Jews of the Diaspora⁴ and to the cultured world of that age. Neither St. Paul, nor any other leader of the Early Church, invented, or could have invented, a new and exclusive Christian language. The most that can be claimed is that he and others appropriated religious terms already in use, and gave to them a new, deeper, richer, and more spiritual, because Christian, meaning. The papyri show "that St. Paul used the customary polite form which was universal

¹ Cp. Reitzenstein, *Die Hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen*, S. 43.

² Jewish Roman citizens had to wear the garb ordained for all Roman citizens; cp. 2 Tim. iv. 13, τὸν φεδόνην, the pænula; cp. Juster, *Les Juifs dans l'empire romain*, ii. p. 215.

³ The Koine "is the Greek vernacular of the first century A.D. . . . Its main constituents seem to be Attic and Ionic speech"; cp. Jackson and Lake, *Beginnings of Christianity*, pt. I. vol. ii. pp. 30, 32. Boulanger thinks it is possible that Greek was the first language learnt by St. Paul, and that he may have attended in Tarsus the schools of the Greek grammarians; cp. *Orphée*, p. 87.

⁴ The general language of the Diaspora was Greek. The notable exception was in Syria, where Aramaic was spoken. Cp. Friedländer, *Roman Life and Manners*, iii. p. 178; cp. Cowley, *Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century B.C.*, p. xv.

among the middle classes at that period.”¹ Using the language as a whole, could St. Paul, with his intense personal interest in religion, have ignored the specifically religious terms of that language or their significance? Even a cautious writer like Dr. Kennedy is ready to admit that to St. Paul many of the “liturgical formulæ” and “the technical terms of ritual in common circulation” must have been familiar.² In determining the influence of the technical terms of the Mystery religions on St. Paul, it has always to be kept in mind that it is difficult to fix with exactness the date of the older forms of the Hermetic writings which illustrate these religions, or to say how far there was at least indirect influence exercised by Christianity and Judaism on their ritual and ideas. It is certainly going too far to suppose that St. Paul was ever an initiate of any of the Mystery religions.³ His appropriation and use of pagan religious terms did not require this. He simply followed the precedent already exemplified in the LXX,⁴ and employed by his contemporary, Philo,⁵ and by other Christian writers.⁶ He took over pagan religious terms and transformed them by imparting a new and richer meaning to them and inspiring them with the spirit of Christianity. In nothing does he show himself greater than in this.⁷

¹ Cp. Cobern, *The New Archæological Discoveries and their Bearing upon the New Testament*, p. 117.

² Cp. Kennedy, *St. Paul and the Mystery Religions*, p. 118. Kennedy thinks, however, in opposition to Reitzenstein, that it is highly precarious to postulate any acquaintance by St. Paul, of Hellenistic religious literature.

³ Cp. Carpenter, *Pagan and Christian Creeds*, p. 253.

⁴ Cp. Felten, *Neutest. Zeitgeschichte*, ii. S. 552.

⁵ “The tractates of Philo and the Trismegistic sermons have both a common background—Hellenistic theology or theosophy. Both use a common language”; cp. Mead, *Thrice-Greatest Hermes*, i. p. 202.

⁶ “Es ist kaum denkbar, dass die christliche Literatur nicht den vorhandenen Wort- und Formelschatz zum Teil übernehmen musste”; cp. Reitzenstein, *Poimandres*, S. 247; cp. Felten, *Neutest. Zeitgeschichte*, ii. S. 552; cp. Estlin Carpenter, “Christianity in the Light of Historical Science,” *The Examiner*, Oct. 1905, pp. 668 ff.: “The inscriptions reveal to you the very language of Christianity in the making.”

⁷ Cp. Naville, Introduction, p. xviii (Cobern, *The New Archæological Discoveries and their Bearing upon the New Testament*); cp. Robertson, *Paul, the Interpreter of Christ*, p. 27.

Quite independently, as has been already pointed out, the pagan mind, as truly as the mind of Israel, had discovered the sublime truth of Monotheism. This truth, however, impressed each of them in a way which was in keeping with their respective genius. The more clearly the Greeks apprehended the Oneness of Deity, the more they tended to think of Him as a principle rather than a Person.¹ The Israelites, on the other hand, were increasingly impressed with the thought of the personal nature of the One Living and True God. The Greeks had a richer conception of the all-comprehensiveness of God as at once embracing all, and being in fact all in all. There can be no doubt that St. Paul was deeply influenced by Greek thought in this respect.²

Unquestioning belief in the Oneness of God had been long settled in the history of St. Paul's own people. Pagan theocrasia,³ or the fusion of one god with another, was not needed by the Jew. Still we may be sure that St. Paul felt sympathetic towards all the patient groping of the pagan mind in quest of the sublime truth monotheism, even when he might not be able to approve of the methods employed.

The knowledge of the essential attributes of God was part of St. Paul's heritage from Judaism. But that knowledge received both confirmation and illustration from the rich store of pagan religious life and thought.

¹ The Greeks, however, recognised that God was essentially mind. To Plato, God is the highest Idea. "The Mind, O Tat, is of God's very essence"; "The Mind in men is God"; cp. About the Common Mind of Hermes to Tat, § 1.

² Cp. Acts xvii. 28; Rom. xi. 36. This latter is a Stoic doxology; cp. Norden, *Agnostos Theos*, SS. 240 ff.; cp. The General Sermon to Asclepius, §§ 5, 6. "Cosmos is subject then to God, man to the cosmos, and irrationals to man. But God is over them all, and God contains them all"; cp. The Key of Thrice-Greatest Hermes, § 22. "All are in God"; cp. Mind unto Hermes, § 18. "And in the All is naught that is not God"; cp. About the Common Mind of Hermes to Tat, § 23. "And yet the All, the universe itself, is not something other than God; it is all God"; cp. The Secret Sermon on the Mountain, § 18. "God is at once 'One' and 'All'"; cp. The Perfect Sermon, ii. §§ 1, 2, xx. § 2.

³ Theocrasia was an essential part of the Eleusinian religion.

Paganism clearly recognised the eternal nature of God.¹ It was convinced of the truth of His omnipresence.² When we claim that the really valuable conception of the omniscience of God in the Pauline theology is the religious and moral conception, the same claim can rightly be made for the pagan conception. The suggestion of unlimited power and uniform orderliness in the cosmos appealed at least as strongly to the pagan as to the Jewish mind. It recognised that all things were subject to the Divine Will, even what men called necessity or fate,³ and that God is self-sufficient, needing nothing.⁴

To paganism, as to St. Paul, God is Wisdom, Holiness, Righteousness. His Holiness is the absolute reality of moral perfection. His righteousness is shown in His active relationships with human beings capable of ethical choice and decision.⁵ To both He is in Himself the Pleroma of goodness,⁶ the Source of all that is beautiful⁷ and good, the God who by His very nature has to do good.⁸ To St. Paul the entire creation as the work of God is originally good.

¹ Cp. Reitzenstein, *Poimandres*, xvi. § 13: καὶ ὡς περ ὁ θεὸς οὐτε ἀρχὴν οὐτε τέλος ἔχει, οὕτως οὐδὲ ἡ ποιησις αὐτοῦ ἀρχὴν ἢ τέλος ἔχει . . .

² "Thou art all that which doth exist"; cp. Though Unmanifest, God is Most Manifest, § 10. God is "made manifest through all"; cp. Mind Unto Hermes, § 22; cp. Rom. i. 20 ff.

³ "The Supreme Deity rules this world"; cp. Cicero, *Dream of Scipio*. "Fate, Necessity, and Order" are the expression of God's will and cannot be changed; cp. The Perfect Sermon, xl. § 1.

⁴ "For naught is there of which He [God] stands in need, in that He is all things, or all are in Him"; cp. The Perfect Sermon, xli. § 2; cp. Acts xvii. 25; cp. for a similar idea, Euripides, *Herc.* 1346. Aristides, a Christian who retained the philosophic manner, emphasises the view that God "stands in need of naught, but everything stands in need of Him"; cp. *The Apology of Aristides*, Syriac translation of seventh century, found in 1889 by Rendel Harris. The original was probably written between A.D. 124-40.

⁵ Cp. Rom. iii. 21 ff.

⁶ "God is the Pleroma of Good, and Good of God"; cp. In God Alone is Good and Elsewhere Nowhere, § 4; The General Sermon to Asclepius, §§ 14-16; cp. The Key of Thrice-Greatest Hermes, § 1; cp. Eph. iii. 19; Col. ii. 9.

⁷ "God's essence is the Beautiful"; cp. In God Alone is Good, and Elsewhere Nowhere, § 4. "There is nothing to show that Philo regarded matter *per se* as evil"; cp. Kennedy, *Philo's Contribution to Christianity*, p. 74.

⁸ "Just as man cannot live apart from life, so neither can God live without (His) doing good"; cp. Mind unto Hermes, § 17.

The tragic fact of evil is now alike in the cosmos and in human life.¹ But that is due to sin. Restoration is possible through the grace of God in Jesus Christ.

Although it is difficult to reconcile the ideas set forth in the Hermetic literature, the view expressed there is on the whole the same as that held by St. Paul.² To both, God is at once Creator³ and First Cause.⁴ To both, He is Father,⁵ the Bountiful Giver of manifold gifts to men,⁶ the God whose beneficent Providence is operative everywhere, and in whom men find protection and hope as over against the relentless driving force of fate.⁷

It cannot justly be maintained that St. Paul derived his knowledge of any of the attributes of God from paganism alone; but that he found a knowledge of these in his pagan environment and of purely pagan origin cannot be denied, and it is impossible to think otherwise than that his own views were to some extent at least influenced thereby.

All religions claim that they have a knowledge of

¹ Cp. "Naught's good upon the earth; naught's bad in heaven"; cp. Of Piety and (True) Philosophy, § 10. Matter "doth share in good"; "In this way is the Cosmos good"; cp. In God Alone is Good, and Elsewhere Nowhere, § 2. "Cosmos is beautiful, but is not good—for that is material and freely passible"; cp. The Key of Thrice-Greatest Hermes, § 10.

² "What (then) is God? The Good that naught can change. What man? The bad that can be changed"; cp. Of Piety and (True) Philosophy, § 15.

³ Cp. Though Unmanifest, God is Most Manifest, §§ 4-9.

⁴ Cp. The General Sermon to Asclepius, § 14.

⁵ Dionysus is addressed as "father"; cp. Melanippides, 6 (middle of fifth century); cp. ὁ δὲ πάντων πατήρ ὁ Νοῦς, ὦν ζωὴ καὶ φῶς, Reitzenstein, *Poimandres*, i. §§ 12, 21; cp. The General Sermon to Asclepius, § 17; Though Unmanifest, God is Most Manifest, § 10; (A Letter) of Thrice-Greatest Hermes to Asclepius, § 4; The Encomium of Kings, § 12. Cp. Rom. vi. 4; 1 Cor. i. 3, viii. 6; 2 Cor. i. 2, etc.

⁶ "All (are) in Thee; all (are) from Thee, O Thou who givest all, and takest naught"; cp. Though Unmanifest, God is Most Manifest, § 10.

⁷ "There is not a (single) space bereft of Providence"; "Now Providence is the Self-perfect Reason"; cp. Of Providence and Fate; cp. Eph. iii. 10 ff.

Seneca, a contemporary of St. Paul (4 B.C.-65 A.D.), believed in Providence.

God to give to the world. Where they vary is in the nature and extent of that knowledge and in the certainty wherewith they know. Christianity, as presented by St. Paul, asserted at once that it had the truest and fullest knowledge of God, in fact a unique knowledge, and did so without a shadow of doubt or hesitation. St. Paul conceived of God as at all times both knowable and desiring to be known. What Jesus Christ, his Crucified and Risen Lord, meant above all things to him was that this Jesus Christ embodied the fullest knowledge of God which man could possibly obtain. Since His coming there was no more need for men to worry about an Unknown God. "What therefore ye worship in ignorance, this set I forth unto you."¹ These may not have been the actual words spoken by St. Paul; but we can have no doubt that they aptly expressed what he thought.

The Jewish claim to know the One Living and True God was emphatic. The Christian claim was not less so. St. Paul was trained in a school of emphasis, and certainly carried the spirit of his school into his life and doctrine as a Christian apostle.

But the claim to know God was not wanting in the pagan religions of St. Paul's day.² It might not be either as clear or as certain as it was in Judaism and Christianity, but it was there, and could not fail to impress St. Paul. He must have been led to examine this claim and to estimate its value.

To St. Paul, God revealed Himself in His works of creation, in the cosmos, in the law revealed by the cosmos, as truly as in the Moral Law, in history, and

¹ Cp. Acts xvii. 23.

² "Not that, however, God ignoreth man; nay, right well doth He know him, and willeth to be known"; cp. The Key of Thrice-Greatest Hermes, § 15. Speaking of God's gnosis, "This is the way up to the Mount"; cp. *op. cit.* "Holy art Thou, O God, who willeth to be known, and art known by Thine own"; cp. *Poimandres*, The Shepherd of Men, § 31. From a prayer, *πλάτος, βάθος, μήκος, ὕψος*; cp. *Poimandres* (Reitzenstein), S. 25; cp. Eph. iii. 18, where St. Paul is speaking of "the knowledge"; cp. Lueken, *H. C. Epheser*, S. 360.

particularly in the history of His own people, in all that we mean by religion, in men as a whole and as individuals, and most fully and clearly in Jesus Christ, His Son, our Lord.

With the exception of the last, paganism recognised substantially the same things. He was the God who revealed Himself at once as Mind and Nature,¹ the Creator,² the Universal Spirit,³ the Mover of all things,⁴ the Will operative everywhere,⁵ the God who in special ways manifests Himself.⁶

From his intimate knowledge of the LXX, St. Paul was abundantly familiar with the conception of the "mystery" of God. Its meaning there is generally "secrets" or "secret plans," and the word is usually applied to that which is human; but sometimes to God's "mystery."

¹ Cp. The Sacred Sermon of Hermes.

² The Olympian gods did not claim to be the creators of the cosmos, but only its conquerors. But a long step forward had been taken since the Olympian gods reigned supreme in men's minds.

³ "God is Universal Spirit"; cp. The Encomium of Kings, § 3.

⁴ "This is God's sense and thought, ever to move all things"; cp. On Thought and Sense, § 9.

⁵ The teaching of The Key of Thrice-Greatest Hermes is that the entire Universe with all that it contains is due to the active operation of God's will; cp. Mead, *Thrice-Greatest Hermes*, ii. p. 160.

⁶ In the cosmos, "Cosmos is God's Son"; cp. On Thought and Sense, § 8; cp. Rom. i. 20. In the *στοιχεῖα*, a number of divine entities constitute together the All-God; these are His *στοιχεῖα*; cp. Reitzenstein, *Poimandres*, S. 269. "And from the union of these (four) is spirit born" (the "four" are the *στοιχεῖα*); cp. Of Soul, ii. § 2. St. Paul uses the word *στοιχεῖα* in a bad sense; cp. Gal. iv. 3, 9; Col. ii. 8, 20. But we may be certain that he also knew of the use of the word in its simple physical sense. In the "logos," "Holy art Thou, who didst by Word [Logos] make to consist the things that are"; cp. *Poimandres*, The Shepherd of Men, § 31, Mead, ii. p. 19. While in St. Paul's teaching there is not the definite Logos doctrine which we find in St. John's Gospel, still, to St. Paul, Christ "is the image of the invisible God, the firstborn of all creation; for in Him were all things created"; cp. Col. i. 15, 16. In the Æon: "Der *Alōn* oder *χρόνος* ist zugleich der *δημιουργός*"; cp. Reitzenstein, *Poimandres*, S. 276; cp. SS. 274, 277, 278, 287; cp. Mind Unto Hermes, § 2. Mead affirms that St. Paul shows acquaintance with the Æon doctrine; cp. *Thrice-Greatest Hermes*, ii. p. 192. For Pauline uses of Æon, cp. Gal. i. 4; 1 Cor. i. 20, ii. 6, 8, iii. 18; 2 Cor. iv. 4; Rom. xii. 2; Eph. i. 21, ii. 2; Tit. ii. 12; cp. Eph. i. 21, and inscription on amulet (Reitzenstein, *Poimandres*, S. 295): "χερουβίμ, ἀρχαί, ἐξουσiai, θρόνοι, κυριότητες, ἐξαπτέρυγα, πολυδύματα, καὶ αἱ δυνάμεις."

In the Gospels, it is once used of the secret purposes of God in regard to His kingdom,¹ and indicates that these secret purposes are being revealed in Jesus Christ.

In St. Paul's writings, we find both these uses exemplified, and, in some cases, there is an eschatological meaning in his usage.² To St. Paul, there is embodied in the "mystery," the secret purpose of God in general, and, in particular, the "mystery" as embodied in Jesus Christ the Saviour, a "mystery" of which St. Paul had direct knowledge in his own personal experience.

Now "musterion," "mystery," was a word abundantly used in a religious sense alike in the papyri and in the Mystery religions. It has uniformly a suggestion of something that is secret, or is to be kept secret. It may indicate the hidden meaning of a phrase or word, a magical action in the performance of some act of ritual, a revelation, or a prayer divinely taught.

There is at once similarity and dissimilarity in the respective uses made by St. Paul and by the Mystery religions.³ What is certain is that St. Paul could not fail to come into contact with the Mystery religions, and what we may be sure is also certain, is that these Mystery religions could not fail to influence his religious thought.

To St. Paul, the Christians were the children of light, the possessors of the light, a light which came straight from God Himself, and was abundantly revealed in Jesus Christ, His Son.⁴

There is precedent, in part at least, for his use of the word $\phi\omega\varsigma$, and the cognate terms $\phi\omega\tau\acute{\iota}\zeta\omega$ and $\phi\omega\tau\iota\sigma\mu\acute{o}\varsigma$,⁵

¹ Cp. Mark iv. 11; Matt. xiii. 11; Luke viii. 10.

² Cp. 2 Thess. ii. 6-8; 1 Cor. iv. 1, xiii. 2, xv. 51; Rom. xi. 25; Eph. i. 9 ff., iii. 3 ff.; Col. i. 26 ff., ii. 2, iv. 3.

³ Norden points out the striking similarity between Rom. xi. 25 ff. and a Hermetic text; cp. *Agnostos Theos*, S. 296. In Poimandres, we find that the first appearance of man on the earth is described as "the mystery kept hid until this day"; cp. Mead, *Thrice-Greatest Hermes*, ii. p. 37. In the Pauline thought it is the Second Man, Christ, who is the wonderful mystery of God kept hid till His appearing.

⁴ Cp. 1 Thess. v. 5; 2 Cor. iv. 6, vi. 14; Rom. xiii. 12; Eph. v. 8, 9, 13; Col. i. 12; 1 Tim. vi. 16.

⁵ $\phi\omega\tau\acute{\iota}\zeta\omega$ in the LXX translates the Hebrew verb $\קָרָא$, which in the hiphil means "to cause to shine"; cp. Ps. cv. 39. $\phi\omega\tau\iota\sigma\mu\acute{o}\varsigma$

in the LXX. "Light," used with a religious force, plays a large part in the Hermetic literature.¹

This "light" of the pagan religious world² might not exactly be the light which shone round about St. Paul on the Damascus road, it might not have the same fullness and clearness as that light which St. Paul felt to be for evermore shining in his heart and coming straight from the Risen Lord, but that it was to great multitudes of earnest men spiritual light, the best that they had found, could not fail to evoke the sympathetic interest of a man like St. Paul.

In immediate connection with the conception of God as "light," and as revealing Himself in "light," we must consider what is meant by "seeing God." In the Old Testament there is evidence of a twofold tradition.³ On the one hand, there is the tradition that God may not be seen. To see Him would mean immediate death.⁴ In keeping with this, there were no images of God in the oldest form of the Hebrew cult. The tradition is of purely Hebrew origin.⁵ On the other hand, there was the tradition that God could be seen by men. This

translates the Hebrew noun *קָדוֹר*, meaning "shining light"; cp. Ps. xc. 8. St. Paul uses these words to mean "spiritual illumination," a meaning in keeping with that found in the LXX; cp. 2 Cor. iv. 4, 6; Eph. i. 18, iii. 9.

¹ Cp. (from *The Mystic Rite of the Flame*), "I invoke Thee, O God, the Living One . . . Thou unseen Father of the Light," Mead, *Thrice-Greatest Hermes*, p. 93. "And I see a vision limitless, all things turned into Light"; cp. *Poimandres*, The Shepherd of Men, § 4, Mead, ii. p. 4. *ὁ Νοῦς, ὡς ἰωὴ καὶ φῶς*; cp. Reitzenstein, *Poimandres*, i. § 12. Bousset points out that the combination of "light" and "life," which we find in St. John's Gospel, is characteristic of *Poimandres*; cp. *Kyrios Christos*, S. 212.

² Böhlig thinks that the concrete antithesis between light and darkness, which is characteristic of St. Paul, may have been due to the influence of Mithraism, even though, in all probability, St. Paul was not directly familiar with Mithraism; cp. *Die Geisteskultur von Tarsos*, SS. 103, 105.

³ Baudissin, "'Gott Schauen' in der alttestamentlichen Religion" (*Archiv für Religionswissenschaft*, xviii. 1915), SS. 188, 224.

⁴ Cp. Gen. xxxii. 31; Ex. iii. 6, xxxiii. 20, 23; Judg. vi. 22 ff., xiii. 22; 1 Kings xix. 13; Isa. vi. 2, 5. Cp. what is said by Manoah and his wife: "We shall surely die, because we have seen the Lord face to face"; cp. the so-called *Biblical Antiquities of Philo* (James's transl.), p. 197.

⁵ Cp. Baudissin, *op. cit.* S. 188; cp. Ex. xx. 4.

tradition is of non-Israelite origin, and was probably appropriated by the Hebrews from the Canaanites.¹ The "seeing God" or "the face of God"² has usually to do with some sacred place, particularly the temple.³ There are, however, notable exceptions.⁴ To see "the face of Jahweh" finds a parallel in seeing the face of the king.⁵

Like many other conceptions in the Old Testament, "seeing God" underwent development. In the older sense, it is not characteristic of the prophets. To them, the only satisfactory way to God is by rendering sincere obedience to His Torah.⁶ We may regard the prophets, with their deeper spiritual understanding, as contributing to the more developed conception of "seeing God" in the sense of its being an experience of the inner life. Theophanies⁷ and visions⁸ would tend towards the same end.

Alongside of this growing tendency to regard "see-

¹ Cp. Baudissin, *op. cit.* S. 224.

² Baudissin points out that where the *qal* of רָאָה, "to see the face of Jahweh"; cp. S. 181. "The face of Jahweh" came to mean one aspect of Jahweh, the revelation of Himself to the world, or to His people, or to the pious; cp. Baudissin, S. 198. Baudissin thinks that the "seeing of God" by the epoptes was originally simply seeing the image of the god; cp. S. 224.

³ Cp. Gen. xii. 7, xviii. 1, xxvi. 24, xxxii. 30, xxxv. 1; Ps. lxiii. 2.

⁴ In the Elohistic writing, God appears to men in dreams at places which are not sacred; cp. Gen. xx. 3 ff., xxxi. 11 ff., 24; Num. xxii. 9, 20. Cp. Ps. xi. 7, xvii. 5; Job, xix. 26 ff., xxxiii. 26; Isa. xxxviii. 11, which have nothing to do with the temple cult.

⁵ Referring to Moses, Baudissin says: "Der Ausdruck 'Jahwes Angesicht sehen' will danach offenbar ursprünglich verstanden sein ganz ebenso wie der Parallele für das Auftreten vor dem König"; cp. S. 198. In the Assyrian, as in the Hebrew, we find the phrase "to see the face of the king"; cp. Baudissin, S. 191.

⁶ Cp. Baudissin, S. 212. In the prophets we can distinguish between the use of the two Hebrew verbs רָאָה and חָזַק. רָאָה has to do with the present, and with what the prophets can apprehend as such. It has to do with seeing visions. חָזַק has to do with what is future or hidden, with what may be purely imaginary, whereas רָאָה has to do with what is real. חָזַק, never רָאָה, is used of the false prophets; cp. Baudissin, S. 211 n.

⁷ Cp. Ex. xxiv. 10 ff.; Num. xii. 8; Job xlii. 5. The theophany in Job xxxviii. 1 has nothing to do with a holy place. חָזַק is used of the theophany in Ex. xxiv. 11.

⁸ Cp. Amos ix. 1; Isa. vi. 1; 1 Kings xxii. 19.

The LXX has allowed the active (*qal*) to remain where "seeing God" has to do with visions, e.g. Ex. xxiv. 10; Ps. xi. 7, etc.

ing God" as an experience of the inner spiritual life, there was also an eschatological movement. Men would eventually see God, in the most literal sense, face to face; but this was to be a privilege of men of the coming age. Philo's conception of "seeing God" may also be regarded as a contribution in the transition to the fuller conception. Philo considered "seeing" as a higher stage of the apprehension of God.¹ This interpretation is different from what we find in the Old Testament, and prepared the way for the New Testament view.

In the teaching and experience of St. Paul, we find alike visions, theophanies, and the conception of "seeing God." In late Judaism, as in the New Testament, the longing to "see God" has still to do with the temple, but it is now the Heavenly temple. St. Paul's understanding of the conception, like that of the New Testament generally, is eschatological.²

In St. Paul's teaching there is probably not the same pronounced association of the mystic "seeing" with faith, nor the same emphasis on the doctrine that it is on faith and "seeing" that all true knowledge rests, as we find to be the case in the teaching of the Fourth Gospel;³ but in the case of St. Paul these three, faith, mystic "seeing," and knowledge of God, are undoubtedly bound up together.

¹ "Ebenso ist deutlich bei dem Alexandriner Philo das Schauen eine höhere Stufe des Erkennens, und 'Gott Schauen' wäre nach ihm, wenn es erreichbar sein sollte, die höchste Stufe eben dieses Schauens"; cp. Baudissin, S. 229.

² "In den neutestamentlichen Aussagen vom Gottschauen ist zum Teil ausdrücklich, zum anderen Teil doch mit grösster Wahrscheinlichkeit, von einem jenseitigen Schauen im vollendeten Gottesreich die Rede"; cp. Baudissin, S. 219. Baudissin thinks it possible that Ps. xi. 7, xvii. 15; Job xix. 26 ff., refer to "seeing God" in the life to come. So also in the Babylonian Talmud (Berakot, 17 a Z. 10), "seeing God" is eschatological; cp. S. 220; cp. 1 Cor. xiii. 12; cp. *The Odes of Solomon*, xiii., "Behold! the Lord is our mirror"; cp. 1 Cor. xiii. 12, "face to face," and Ex. xxxiii. 11; Num. xii. 8; Deut. xxxiv. 10.

³ "Glaube und Schauen sind Korrelatbegriffe"; "Auf der mystischen Schauen und auf dem Glauben beruht die Gnosis des vierten Evangeliums." θεωρεῖν und γινώσκειν werden fast synonym gebraucht und wechseln mit einander ab"; cp. Baudissin, SS. 207-8.

Now even admitting that St. Paul's conception of "seeing God," as one of the ways of knowing Him, is directly of Jewish origin, we have to bear in mind that it was in large measure derived originally from a Canaanite source, and not only that, but we have to bear in mind that the pagan world had a tradition in regard to this "God-seeing" of its own, and of long standing. It is a feature of Egyptian,¹ Assyrian,² and Greek religious life.³ It is a distinctive characteristic of the Hermetic literature.⁴

How far St. Paul and other New Testament writers were directly influenced by the purely pagan conception is most difficult to determine. Baudissin would seem to support the view that the Mystery religions had little or no influence on the development of the New Testament idea.⁵ Rather would he support the view that the Jewish conception of "seeing God" and that of the Greek Mystery religions are ultimately derived from a common source, and passed through a similar development.⁶ It has to be borne in mind, however, that St. Paul must have come into almost daily contact with the life and thought of the Mystery religions, and it is hardly conceivable that their conception of "seeing God" did not in some way influence him. Granted that "seeing God" in the Jewish tradition, which most directly influenced St. Paul, refers to God's nearness, whereas in the Greek Mystery religions, "seeing God" refers to the *γνώσις* of God; it has, nevertheless, to be remembered that near-

¹ "Thou gavest me as a reward a high beautiful altar and to see Amon daily" (from an Egyptian inscription of the Twenty-second Dynasty, *i.e.* c. 800 B.C.). The utterance is that of a layman. Cp. a still older inscription which says of a dead layman, "He lived 88 years, during which he beheld Amon" (Baudissin, S. 218).

² In an Assyrian hymn to Ishtar are found the words, "I looked on Thy Face." The word used is "pān," corresponding to the Hebrew root. The Assyrian expression has to do with a visit to the shrine, or with some act of worship at the shrine; cp. S. 189. For examples of personal names meaning "seeing God," cp. S. 189.

³ Baudissin points out the parallel cases of "seeing God" in the Egyptian religion and in the Eleusinian mysteries; cp. S. 192.

⁴ Cp. Crater, iv. ii; The Key, x. 4 ff.

⁵ Cp. S. 223.

⁶ Cp. S. 224.

ness to God implies experience of Him, and all experience is knowledge.¹ What is absent in the teaching of St. Paul, and present in that of the Mystery religions, is that "seeing God" culminates in deification.² To St. Paul, "seeing God" was rather eschatological in its nature, and is to be associated with the future, that is with the eternal, life. This idea is more explicitly set forth in the Gospel of St. John.

Alike in the Old Testament, in other Jewish writings, and in St. Paul, "hearing" God was a fruitful source of knowledge of Him. The same is true of paganism.³

No one reading the letters of St. Paul could fail to discern how vital a part the "knowledge" of God plays in his thought and life, how fatal it was not to know Him. "Agnosia,"⁴ not knowing God, in the Pauline use, implies wilful ignorance, and is evidently associated with immorality.⁵ The alleged reference of St. Paul, however, to "an unknown God" (Acts

¹ The astronomical-astrological cults, which identified the gods with visible heavenly bodies, so that looking at the stars a man literally beheld God, would naturally give a different understanding of "seeing God" from that of a religion like the Jewish or Christian, where God is regarded as a Spirit or Personality.

² In Poimandres, § 26, to attain to *γνώσις* means to be deified. *ἐξουσία* is the power which comes through having *γνώσις*; cp. § 32; cp. 1 Cor. viii. 9, ix. 3. Reitzenstein would find a parallel between the *δοξάζειν* of St. Paul in Rom. viii. 30 and the *θεοῦν* or *ἀποθεοῦν* of the Mystery religions; cp. *Die Hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen*, S. 181. "Das Wort *ἐξουσία* bedeutet im Zauber jede übernatürliche und geheimnis-volle Kraft, die sich auf ein besonderes Verhältnis zu Gott und eine besondere *γνώσις* gründet"; cp. Reitzenstein, *op. cit.* S. 183. The pagan mystic believed that, even in this present life, it was possible to see God face to face, to be in fact one with deity. In opposition to this, St. Paul believed that it was only in the hereafter that the Christian would be privileged to see God face to face, and that never would the Christian become God or the Holy Spirit. The utmost that the Christian could expect in the afterwards was perfect communion with God, with Christ, and with the Holy Spirit. To St. Paul it was walking by faith, not by sight; cp. 2 Cor. v. 7.

³ In the Poimandres, the writer "hears this Presence rather than sees it"; cp. Mead, *Thrice-Greatest Hermes*, ii. p. 25.

⁴ Cp. 1 Cor. xv. 34; Rom. i. 32. Cp. Wisdom of Solomon xiii. 1 for an example of the Pauline use of the word.

⁵ Cp. Poimandres, i. § 27, for a remarkable association of immorality with *ἀγνοσία*: "Ὁ λαὸς ἄνδρες γηγενεῖς, οἱ μέθη καὶ ὕπνω ἑαυτοὺς ἐκδεδωκότες καὶ τῇ ἀγνοσίᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ . . ."

xvii. 23), probably does not imply any moral slur on the Athenians.¹

"Gnosis," knowledge, is intimately associated by St. Paul with "revelation" ² (ἀποκάλυψις), and is regarded as a supernatural gift, depending on the possession of the Holy Spirit.³

Now we know that St. Paul from an early age was familiar with the conception of the "knowledge" ⁴ of God through his study of the Old Testament. There it generally means knowing or understanding of the Divine Will. But it also may mean the practical wisdom of life, understanding of individual aspects of God's character, as, for example, His Omnipotence, and also knowing Him through His actions concerning His people and in the world at large. The influence of these various presentations of the "knowledge" of God is manifest in St. Paul's idea. It is specially a revelation of the supreme manifestation of God's Will in Jesus Christ, Incarnate, Crucified, Risen, the Spirit. It is essentially a practical knowledge, because, in St. Paul's system, doctrine and morality are inseparably bound up together. It is rich in its portrayal of the attributes of the Divine character, and is to be found in the world of men and things, and most fully in the life of the Christian Church, God's people.

But we must always remember that St. Paul was in daily contact with a world of religious life and thought far bigger than that of Judaism and the LXX. The pagan environment all round him was throbbing with intense religious life, all claiming to be inspired with

¹ ἄγνωστος θεός könnte für griechisches Sprachempfinden nur bedeuten 'der unbekannte (oder der unerkennbare)' Gott"; cp. Norden, *Agnostos Theos*, S. 109.

² Cp. 1 Cor. xiv. 6, 30; 2 Cor. xii. 1; Eph. i. 17. In the Old Testament prophets, "knowledge of God" implies personal experience of the Divine revelation in a man's own heart and life. This resembles St. Paul's view.

³ Cp. Gal. iv. 9; 1 Cor. viii. 1-3, xii. 8, xiii. (where it is subordinate to "love"), 2 Cor. vi. 6, viii. 7; Phil. iii. 8-10.

⁴ There is nothing abstract in the Hebrew word נָחַם, and the Greek translation γνώσις is scarcely its equivalent.

the "knowledge" of God. St. Paul would find evidence of this at every turn of the way. There can be no doubt that he was abundantly familiar with the technical use of the word "gnosis" in Hellenism.¹ There are similarities to his use of the term in the Mystery religions,² and both in St. Paul and in paganism, "gnosis" is less pure knowledge than an internal intuitive feeling.³

Taking all things into consideration, St. Paul, while never losing altogether the influence of his Jewish heredity and training, and while certainly of all men the most Christian, was nevertheless influenced directly and indirectly by his pagan environment in such a way that, without understanding that environment, it would be impossible to understand him.

¹ "Dass Paulus den technischen Gebrauch des Wortes *γνῶσις* im Hellenismus kennt und nachahmt, sollte schon hiernach klar sein"; cp. Reitzenstein, *Die Hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen*, S. 39.

² Cp. Reitzenstein, *op. cit.* SS. 126-7.

³ "Denn die *γνῶσις θεοῦ*, um welche Christ und Heide betet, ist weit weniger ein Wissen als ein inneres Schauen oder Fühlen"; cp. Reitzenstein, *Poimandres*, S. 158.

CHAPTER III

THE MEDIATOR

IN the more highly developed types of religion, it is felt that, along with such means of knowing God as have been dealt with in the preceding chapter, there must be a more direct and efficient means. As the religious instinct is developed and exalted, the Deity is conceived of in an ever loftier and holier form. He tends to become raised to such a sublime height, that a gulf opens up between Him and the worshipper, a gulf which can only be bridged by a divine mediator specially sent.¹ In the later history of Judaism, this process had long been going on. God had become so far removed from men, alike in His majestic power and unapproachable holiness, that men felt that there was no direct way of coming into touch with Him. In other religions there was a corresponding feeling.

This mediator had to be divine, a Son, not necessarily identical with or equal to God, but divine, one who was immediately in contact with God, one sharing as a co-operator in the creative work of God, and yet one at the same time capable of coming into immediate touch with human life.

¹ In Babylonia, Marduk, son of Ea, was the mediator between Ea and men; cp. Jastrow, *Religion of Babylonia and Assyria*, p. 139. Only the living required a mediator, because the dead were near the gods. In early days, kingship was closely bound up with the priestly office. Later, the priests were the sole mediators between the gods and men. Even the king himself had to be conducted into the "holy of holies" of the temple by a priest; cp. Jastrow, pp. 315-16, 328, 628.

In early Dynastic Egypt, the Pharaohs, after death, became mediators between the gods and deceased men; cp. Moret et Davy, *Des Clans aux empires*, p. 176.

Now we do not find in St. Paul's letters an express statement of the doctrine of the personified "Logos," such as is found in the Fourth Gospel.¹ The "Logos" is used by St. Paul in the simplest form, to indicate the spoken or written word, and specially the gospel. But we do find in St. Paul a clear conception of the divinely-sent Mediator.² This Mediator, while it is only after His resurrection that He seems to be installed in an effective sense in His Messianic office,³ was nevertheless pre-existent, truly the "Son of God."⁴ His position as such was unique. It is true that Christians too were "sons of God,"⁵ but only in a derived and subordinate sense. They could only become "sons" through "the Son," through faith in "the Son," through the Holy Spirit, which is Christ the Risen Lord.

Now while we may justly claim that St. Paul's conception alike of the Sonship of Christ and of His followers was of a peculiarly exalted type, still we have to recognise that the idea of sonship of God was part of the pagan heritage.

As pre-existent Son of God, Christ was a world-creating power.⁶ Still he is subordinate to God, the Father. This subordination was necessary to St. Paul's system, in order that he might preserve a firm grip of his pure monotheism. Nowhere does St. Paul call Christ God in an absolute sense.⁷

¹ The Fourth Gospel derived its logos-doctrine from Greek philosophy, through the medium of Philo. The conception of the "Logos" held by Philo was reached under the influence of Hermetic speculations and Egyptian mythology; cp. Bousset, *Kyrios Christos*, S. 390.

² Cp. 1 Tim. ii. 5; cp. Gal. iii. 10.

³ Cp. Rom. i. 3, 4.

⁴ Cp. Gal. i. 16, ii. 20, iv. 4, etc.

⁵ Cp. Gal. iii. 26, iv. 6, 7; Rom. viii. 14, etc.

⁶ Cp. Col. i. 17. Weiss would find a resemblance between Christ as the creator and the world-soul of the Stoics; cp. *Das Urchristentum*, SS. 357, 368. For the relationship of Christ to the material universe, cp. 1 Cor. viii. 6; Rom. viii. 19-22; Eph. i. 10, 21-22; Col. ii. 15.

⁷ "Von einer Gottheit Christi wird man nach alledem im Sinne des Paulus noch nicht eigentlich reden dürfen"; cp. Bousset, *Kyrios Christos*, S. 185; cp. 1 Cor. iii. 22 ff., xi. 3, xv. 24 ff.; Rom. viii. 29. Christ's assumption of the flesh implied not only subordination, but implied subjection to the Law, and to the power of death, and contact with sin. Even if He remained sinless, His flesh was human flesh, that is, flesh in ordinary circumstances liable to sin; cp. Phil. ii. 5. ff. The Fourth Gospel subordinates Christ to the Father; cp. x. 29,

But if, on the one side, Christ is the "Son of God," even if subordinate to the Father, on the other side, He is the heavenly man.¹ He had to be in direct touch with God the Father, and, at the same time, in direct touch with the men whom He came to save. Now St. Paul had clear evidence of the humanity of Jesus, born of the Virgin, in the tradition of the Christian Church. But is there not reason to believe that he was influenced by the conception of the "primitive man" of paganism, particularly as he is presented in the Hermetic literature? Where St. Paul differs is that in contrasting the Second Adam with the First, he places the "Urmensch" not at the beginning, but at the end.² The Second Adam is not so much the perfecting of the First Adam, as rather the death of the natural man.

In seeking the sources of St. Paul's conception of the Mediator, we turn naturally in the first place to the LXX and the Apocryphal writings. There we find indeed the teaching in regard to the Messiah, the coming light of the Gentiles.³ But all that is told of the Jewish Messiah in these sources falls far short of St. Paul's idea of the Mediator, Christ Jesus.⁴ Much would certainly be learned by him from the tradition of the Early Church, and it is possible, though not probable, that he was influenced by Philo.⁵

xiv. 28, etc. It differs from St. Paul's presentation by the emphasis which it lays on the pre-existence of Christ and on His earthly life, and in the absence of antitheses between spirit and flesh and between the First and Second Adam. In Poimandres we read, "But All-Father Mind, being Life and Light, did bring forth Man [i.e. Cosmic Man], co-equal to Himself, with whom He fell in love, as being His own child"; cp. Mead, *Thrice-Greatest Hermes*, ii. p. 8; cp. Phil. ii. 6, which is perhaps an echo of the teaching of Poimandres.

¹ Cp. I Cor. xv. 47: "the second man is of heaven."

² Cp. I Cor. xv. 46; cp. Bousset, *Kyrios Christos*, SS. 159, 168. Clemen thinks that St. Paul (Phil. ii. 6 ff.) is indebted to the Poimandres presentation of the Primal Man; cp. *Prim. Christianity*, p. 158.

³ Cp. Isa. xlii. 6, xlix. 6, li. 4; *Enoch* xlviii. 4; *Siby. Or.* iii. 710-26.

⁴ It is possible that St. Paul had been influenced in his conception of the office of Mediator, by the high sense of the dignified status of the High Priest which marked the post-exilic community.

⁵ To Philo, the chief Mediator is "the image of God" (cp. *de op. m.* iv. 24 f.), the instrument of God in creation, and the "helm" (*οὐαξ*) which guides the universe (*de migr. Abr.* 6).

For a part of the explanation of St. Paul's conception we must turn to the pagan environment. The doctrine of the "logos" goes back to Heraclitus, who claims to be its prophet.¹ By St. Paul's time, many diverse contributions had been made to the formation of the Logos-theology.² The Logos had now become a kind of *δεύτερος θεός*, the Mediator between God and the world. This conception was simply appropriated by Christianity, wholesale as in the case of the Fourth Gospel, and the Christians identified the Logos with Jesus Christ. This last was the new contribution to the Logos-doctrine made by Christianity.

It was impossible that St. Paul should not come into touch with a doctrine so universally held as the Logos-doctrine was,³ and, with his open mind, it was equally impossible to conceive of him as being uninfluenced by it. That St. Paul does not give definite expression to

¹ Cp. "This Word [logos] stands for ever"; "All things come to pass in accordance with this Word"; cp. *Frgs.* 50, 1 (Cornford, *Greek Religious Thought*). Even in Homer, "gods in the likeness of strangers" visit the cities of men; cp. *Odyssey*, xvii. 483. According to Langdon, "Mummu is an ordinary word for 'form,' which was personified as creative reason, and inherent in the first principle water." "Mummu or 'word' then came to mean cosmic reason, and as such it was translated into Greek by *λόγος*"; cp. *The Epic of Creation*, p. 72 n. 1.

² "Griechisch-stoische Philosophie und allegorische Mythendeutung, aber auch lebendige Frömmigkeit und orientalische Mystik, Hermes-verehrung und ägyptische Religion"; cp. Bousset, *Kyrios Christos*, S. 390.

Cp. The Egyptian religion: "Da sendet Gott Osiris und Isis als Menschen zur Erde nieder; sie vermenschlichen den *βλος*, hemmen den Mord, begründen Tempel und Kult, geben die Gesetze, und steigen endlich als Götter wieder zum Himmel empor" (Reitzenstein, *Poimandres*, S. 178).

³ "From all of these indications we are assured that there was already in the first centuries B.C. a well-developed Hellenistic doctrine of the descent of man from the Man Above, and of his return to that heavenly state by his mastery of the powers of the cosmos"; cp. Mead, *Thrice-Greatest Hermes*, p. 197. In the Hermetic Literature, the Logos is "one with the Father" (Mead, ii. p. 35); He is the Word by which "the things that are" are made to consist; cp. *Poimandres*, § 31. God the Father brings forth Man equal to Himself (*ἀπεκύησεν ἄνθρωπον αὐτῷ ὅσον*); cp. *Poimandres*, i. § 12; cp. *Phil.* ii. 6.

"This is the Servant's Form, and this is the necessity of the Descent of the Logos of God into the womb of the Virgin"; cp. Concerning the *Æon*-doctrine, Mead, *Thrice-Greatest Hermes*, i. pp. 398-9; cp. *Phil.* ii. 7, "taking the form of a servant."

the Logos-doctrine, such as we find in the Fourth Gospel, is perhaps to be explained, partly because he wished to emphasise the simple use of the word "Logos" as meaning the gospel message, and partly because he was deeply impressed by the fact of the Personal Jesus as the Divine Mediator between God and man.

The conception of divine sonship had long been a possession of the pagan world. Hermes and Asclepius were "sons of God."¹ The doctrine also finds a place in the Hermetic literature.²

In the Persian religion, Mithras was a mediator between the supreme God, Ahura Mazda, and men, and, just as Christ is subordinate in St. Paul's teaching, so Mithras was subordinate to the supreme God.³

There is at least a suggestion of St. Paul's doctrine of the sonship of Christians through Jesus Christ in the sacred families of Eleusis,⁴ and a decided similarity between the teaching of Philo⁵ and St. Paul.

The divine Mediator, at once God and man, comes as the bearer of "good tidings."⁶ This was the common tradition of the Christian Church, adopted by St. Paul as by other teachers. But the idea that a god had come

¹ Cp. Justin Martyr, *Apol.* xxii. ; cp. Rendel Harris, "On the Name 'Son of God' in Northern Syria" (*Zeitschrift für die Neutest. Wissenschaft*, 1914, Bd. xv. pp. 98 ff.)

² Cp. "Thy sons" (men as children of the Shepherd of Men), *Poimandres*, § 32.

³ Cp. Cumont, *Les Mystères de Mithra*, p. 203. The position of St. Paul as regards the Mediator is as follows. While he uses the word in Gal. iii. 19, 20, it is not in regard to Christ. If we admit Timothy to be a Pauline letter, then 1 Tim. ii. 5 shows that St. Paul expressly identifies Christ and the Mediator. In any case Rom. viii. 34 proves that St. Paul clearly understood the mediatorial character of Christ. St. Paul probably borrowed the word *μεσότης* from Jewish-Hellenistic literature, and the idea embodied in the word from Judaism. There is no proof that he was directly influenced by the religion of Mithras in this regard.

⁴ The Kéryces and Eumolpides ; cp. Foucart, *Les Mystères d'Eleusis*, pp. 143 ff., 157.

⁵ "The Law confirms my suggestion when it declares that those who do what is acceptable . . . and noble are sons of God" (*de spec. leg.* i. 318).

⁶ Cp. 1 Thess. ii. 2, 8, 9, iii. 2 ; 2 Thess. i. 8 ; Gal. i. 7 ; 1 Cor. ix. 12 ; 2 Cor. ii. 12, iv. 4, ix. 13, x. 14 ; Rom. i. 9, xv. 16, 19 ; Eph. ii. 17 ; Phil. i. 27 ; 1 Tim. i. 11.

bearing "good tidings," was not an original idea of Christianity. The pagan world had its Hermes, *Εὐάγγελος*.¹

In keeping with this, the divine Mediator was a Saviour. To St. Paul *σωτηρία* was a comprehensive term, at once metaphysical, spiritual, and ethical.² This "salvation" was particularly associated by St. Paul with Christ's death, in which he was peculiarly interested.³ It formed the cornerstone of his scheme of salvation. The intimate association of Christ's death with deliverance from the Law is due to the originality of St. Paul.⁴

By His death Christ paid our debt to the Law. To St. Paul, Christ's death was penal, and also associated with the idea of atonement. It also meant Christ's victory over the demons.⁵

Now while we must recognise that Jesus Christ was a Saviour in the earliest beliefs of the Church, and while we must equally attribute something to the genius of St. Paul in the development of the doctrine, particularly as regards His death: there can be no doubt that there had been long preparation in the field of paganism, with which St. Paul was coming into constant contact.⁶ The

¹ "Hesychios attests of Hermes the interesting title *Εὐάγγελος*, expressive of the god who 'brings glad tidings.'" The title is also found in a Parian inscription of the first century B.C.; cp. Farnell, *The Cults of the Greek States*, vol. v. pp. 21, 67-8; cp. Justin Martyr, *Apologia*, xxii.; cp. the *κήρυξ* in the Mystery guilds, e.g. at Ephesus (Poland, *Geschichte des Griechischen Vereinswesens*, S. 395).

² Cp. 2 Thess. ii. 13; Gal. ii. 20, iii. 27, iv. 6, v. 16-24; 1 Cor. vi. 17, xii. 13; 2 Cor. v. 14-15; Rom. i. 16, viii. 12, 16, xi. 11; Phil. iii. 8 ff.; Col. ii. 12, iii. 3.

³ Cp. Gal. ii. 20; 2 Cor. v. 14 ff.; Rom. v. 19; Phil. ii. 8, etc.

⁴ Cp. Bousset, *Kyrios Christos*, S. 161.

⁵ Cp. 1 Cor. ii. 8; Col. ii. 15. Bousset holds that St. Paul transformed the old myth of the hero who went down into Hades and wrestled with the demons there. He transferred the conflict to the earth, and makes Christ overcome the demons on the cross. Bousset understands by "the rulers," "die dämonischen Weltbeherrschen"; cp. *Kyrios Christos*, S. 161.

⁶ "Man kann sich aber dem Eindruck kaum entziehen, dass diese ganze Erlösungstheorie und Erlösungsfrömmigkeit des Paulus auf dem Boden hellenistischer Frömmigkeit gewachsen ist"; cp. Bousset, *Kyrios Christos*, S. 164. For the title *Σωτήρ* as applied to pagan gods, cp. Böhlig, *Die Geisteskultur von Tarsos*, SS. 49, 50; cp. Huart, *La Perse antique*, p. 218.

title "Soter" was peculiarly associated with Zeus. Those who worshipped "Zeus Soter" were specially those who had to do with the sea, with war, and with other dangerous occupations. It is peculiarly interesting when we remember the intimate connection that Herakles had with Tarsus, that he, himself a "Soter" god, was closely associated with Zeus as "Soter."¹ Asclepios bears the title "Soter" more frequently than any other god, though he is rather the "Soter" of the bodies of men than of their souls, and is not a saviour in the eschatological sense.²

The expected child of Virgil's Fourth Eclogue, who was almost certainly a real human child, the looked-for son of Augustus, who as a matter of fact, was never born, was to be a restorer, a saviour of the world.³ The source from which Virgil derived his idea was probably the *Cumæum carmen*, a work which was perhaps of Jewish origin, though this was unknown to Virgil.⁴

The pre-Christian Gnostics had their "Saviour" before the Christians had theirs.⁵ The conception of a βασιλεὺς σωτήρ, long established in the Orient, was appropriated by the Hermes-cult.⁶ Even if "Soteria" did not imply any lofty moral ideal in the Mystery religions, it was a very important word there.⁷

In view of the fact that the conception of a divine Saviour was abundantly present in the pagan environment of St. Paul, and had long been so, it is not to be

¹ Cp. Poland, *Geschichte des Griechischen Vereinswesens*, S. 178.

² Asclepios is Φιλάνθρωπος, Φιλόλαος, and Συγγνώμων (at Epidauros); cp. Farnell, *Greek Hero Cults and Ideas of Immortality*, pp. 276, 279.

³ Cp. *Virgil's Messianic Eclogue* (Mayor, Fowler, Conway), pp. 29 (Conway), 79, 83 (Fowler). Reinach would identify the child with Dionysus; cp. *Cultes et Religions*, pp. 79-80. Ramsay would also deny the real humanity and find in the child "the representative of the new Rome."

⁴ Cp. *Virgil's Messianic Eclogue* (Mayor, Fowler, Conway), pp. 106, 114 f. (Mayor). Cp. Reinach, *Cultes et Religions*, p. 83, where he derives the Fourth Eclogue from "l'apocalypse judéo-alexandrine et l'orphisme hellénique."

⁵ Cp. Murray, *Four Stages of Greek Religion*, p. 143.

⁶ Cp. Reitzenstein, *Poimandres*, S. 176.

⁷ Cp. Ramsay, *The Bearing of Recent Discovery on the Trustworthiness of the New Testament*, p. 175.

wondered at if St. Paul should have been influenced thereby. At the same time, we can claim for St. Paul that his conception of the Saviour was more comprehensive than any that had been before him, that it was more spiritual than the pagan idea, and that it was definitely bound up with Jesus Christ, the Son of God,¹ and the Risen Lord, and particularly with His atoning death.

The Mediator, who is Saviour, is also our Lord.² He is the one and only Lord.³ He is God's Son.⁴ He is the Lord who has lived a real human life and died a real human death.⁵ He is the Lord Risen and Exalted.⁶ He is the Lord with power, the source of power.⁷ He is the Lord of all.⁸ He is the source of revelation.⁹ He is the bestower of grace, mercy, and peace.¹⁰ He is the source of hope.¹¹ He is the fount of joy.¹² He is the well-spring of love.¹³ Not to return our love in response to His, is to make ourselves anathema.¹⁴ He is the Lord to whom our bodies, as truly as our souls, belong.¹⁵ He

¹ Son of God was probably the most primitive of the Christological titles. It is used by Christ Himself in the story of the Temptation; cp. Matt. iv. 3, 6.

² Cp. Rom. i. 4, 7, v. 1, 11, 21, vi. 23, vii. 25, viii. 39, etc.; cp. Phil. iii. 20.

³ Cp. 1 Cor. viii. 6; Eph. iv. 5. There may be "many lords" so called in the world; but Jesus Christ is Lord in a unique sense; cp. 1 Cor. viii. 5. The difference between St. Paul's conception of Christ as *ὁ κύριος* and the Kyrios conceptions of paganism is evidenced not only by the *εἰς κύριος*, but also by the *εἰς θεός*; cp. Rohde, "Gottesglaube und Kyriosglaube bei Paulus" (*Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 1923, Bd. xxii. Hefte 1-2, S. 48).

⁴ 2 Cor. i. 3, xi. 31; Rom. xv. 6; Eph. i. 3; Col. i. 3.

⁵ Cp. 1 Thess. ii. 15; Gal. i. 19, vi. 14; 1 Cor. ix. 5, xi. 26. He is the Lord whom St. Paul himself has seen; cp. 1 Cor. ix. 1, xv. 8. Bousset maintains that, to St. Paul, it is not the historical Jesus who is *ὁ κύριος*, but the pre-existing Christ; cp. *Kyrios Christos*, S. 144.

⁶ Cp. 1 Cor. vi. 14; 2 Cor. iv. 14; Rom. iv. 24; Col. iv. 1; cp. Rohde, "Gottesglaube und Kyriosglaube bei Paulus," S. 52 ff.

⁷ Cp. 1 Cor. v. 4; 2 Cor. xiii. 10; Eph. vi. 10.

⁸ Cp. Rom. x. 12.

⁹ Cp. 1 Cor. xi. 23; 2 Cor. xii. 1.

¹⁰ Cp. 1 Cor. i. 3; 2 Cor. i. 2, viii. 9, xiii. 14; Gal. i. 3, vi. 18; Rom. xvi. 20; Eph. i. 2; Phil. i. 2; 1 Tim. i. 2; 2 Tim. i. 2.

¹¹ Cp. 1 Thess. i. 3; Phil. ii. 19. It has been remarked that the word that occurs most frequently in the Christian catacombs is "spes."

¹² Cp. Phil. iv. 4.

¹³ Cp. Eph. vi. 23.

¹⁴ Cp. 1 Cor. xvi. 22.

¹⁵ Cp. 1 Cor. vi. 13.

is the Lord who justifies,¹ the Lord through whom victory is given.² He is the Lord who is the theme of preaching,³ the Lord upon whom we call,⁴ the Lord whom we confess,⁵ the Lord whom we serve,⁶ the Lord whom we put on,⁷ the Lord for whom we live and die,⁸ the Lord with whom we share an unbroken fellowship so long as we are loyal to Him.⁹ He is, above all, the Lord who will surely come again with power, and for whose royal parousia men eagerly waited.¹⁰

Whence did St. Paul derive this conception of the Lord? It was not so much from the influence of the LXX, as rather from the religious atmosphere in which the Gentile churches originated and from Christ Himself. The Gentile Christians were already familiar with the use of the term *ὁ κύριος* as applied to pagan deities. Becoming Christians, they appropriated the term and applied it to Jesus Christ. At the same time they identified Jesus Christ with the *ὁ κύριος* of the LXX.¹¹

The title *ὁ κύριος* does not occur in the Logia.¹² It is frequently found in St. Luke and Acts, which form a bridge between the other two synoptic Gospels and St. Paul. Jesus Himself definitely claims the title.¹³ In the Fourth Gospel, while Jesus Christ is the Lord, the

¹ Cp. 1 Cor. vi. 11.

² Cp. 2 Cor. iv. 5.

³ Cp. 1 Cor. xii. 3; Rom. x. 9.

⁴ Cp. Rom. xiii. 14.

⁵ Cp. 1 Cor. i. 9.

⁶ Cp. 1 Cor. xv. 57.

⁷ Cp. 1 Cor. i. 2; Rom. x. 13.

⁸ Cp. Rom. xii. 11.

⁹ Cp. Rom. xiv. 8.

¹⁰ Cp. 1 Thess. ii. 19, iii. 13, iv. 15, 16, 17, v. 2, 23; 2 Thess. i. 7, ii. 1, 2; 1 Cor. i. 8, iv. 5, v. 5, xvi. 22; Phil. iii. 20; 1 Tim. vi. 14; 2 Tim. iv. 8. For the use of *παρουσία* as applied to the visit of one of the Ptolemaic kings (third century B.C. papyrus), cp. Milligan, *Here and There among the Papyri*, pp. 75, 76; cp. also Petition from the Serapeum Twins, B.C. 163-2, Milligan, *Greek Papyri*, p. 15.

¹¹ Cp. 1 Cor. ii. 16, Rom. xi. 34, and Isa. xl. 13; cp. Rom. xiv. 11, and Isa. xlv. 23; cp. 1 Cor. i. 31, 2 Cor. x. 17, and Jer. ix. 22 ff. "Kyrios im religiösen Sinn ist für Juden im Zeitalter Jesus nur Gott, niemand sonst"; cp. Böhlig, *Die Geisteskultur von Tarsos*, S. 54.

¹² "In den Logien findet sich der Titel *ὁ κύριος* nirgends"; cp. Bousset, *Kyrios Christos*, S. 96.

¹³ Cp. Matt. xxi. 3; Mark xi. 3; Luke xix. 31. *ὁ κύριος* here is practically equivalent to *ὁ διδάσκαλος*. The word occurs twice in the non-genuine conclusion of St. Mark; cp. Mark xvi. 19, 20; cp. Böhlig, *Die Geisteskultur von Tarsos*, S. 54.

humanity of Christ is emphasised. The flesh of Christ is real flesh, the flesh in which He appeared on earth, and the flesh given in the supper. This emphasis is not characteristic of St. Paul's teaching, even if St. Paul does recognise that Christ, God's Son, was also the historical Jesus.¹ To him, the Lord is above all the Lord who is the Pneuma.

The natural environment in which the worship of Jesus Christ as Lord would arise would not be the primitive Jewish church, but the Gentile churches. The strict monotheism of the Jewish church would be a hindrance to its origin in the former. It is to the Gentile churches that we must look for the origin of the Aramaic phrase "Maranatha,"² The title *ὁ κύριος* came more and more to express in a comprehensive manner the supreme position held by Jesus in the worship of the Gentile Christian communities.³

To understand alike the origin and the development of the Christian conception of Jesus Christ as *ὁ κύριος*, we must appreciate the meaning of the title used in a religious sense already in paganism. It was abundantly applied to pagan deities, and is often found in the pre-Christian inscriptions.⁴ Like so many other religious ideas, it came from the Orient, laid hold of Græco-Roman religious life, and had a special home in Syria and Egypt.⁵

While the title *ὁ κύριος* was applied to Roman em-

¹ Cp. Weiss, *Das Problem der Entstehung des Christentums*, S. 515.

² Cp. Bousset, *Kyrios Christos*, S. 103 n. Maranatha is either "the Lord cometh" (R.V. marg.) or "our Lord, come" (Bickell). In opposition to Bousset's view, Karl Ludwig Schmidt thinks that "Maranatha" originated in the Christian community at Jerusalem; cp. "Eschatologie und Mystik im Urchristentum" (*Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 1922, Bd. xxi. S. 285).

³ "The appellation of Jesus as Lord, which is certainly characteristic of the editor of Acts, was a long step in the direction of deification and consequent worship"; cp. Jackson and Lake, *Beginnings of Christianity*, pt. i. vol. ii. p. 191.

⁴ Cp. Bousset, *Kyrios Christos*, S. 111 ff. Böhlig suggests that the use of *κύριος* on the coins of Tarsus may point to the fact "dass der Name Herr für die Gottheit dieser Gegend bis in die Hittiterzeit zurückreicht"; cp. *Die Geisteskultur von Tarsos*, S. 55.

⁵ Cp. Bousset, *Kyrios Christos*, S. 118.

perors, and only applied after the recognition of their divinity,¹ it is not to be inferred that the Christian meaning of the term arose through the Christian opposition to the use of this term as applied to the emperors.² Rather is the religious use of the term by the Christians to be derived from Christ Himself, and from the general pagan environment, and applied by them, conspicuously by St. Paul, to Jesus Christ.

Jesus Christ, who is our Lord, is also the Holy Spirit. As we should expect, when St. Paul is speaking of the Holy Spirit, there are certain characteristics of Jesus Christ as Lord which are not given as features of the Holy Spirit. The Holy Spirit is not spoken of as God's Son. It could not be said of Him that He lived a real human life, and died a real human death, in the way that it is so said of Jesus Christ as our Lord. Nor could there be the expected Second Coming of the Holy Spirit as there was the expected Second Coming of Jesus Christ, our Lord.

All the same, Jesus Christ is not only expressly identified with the Holy Spirit,³ but that identification is implied in the salient characteristics of the Holy Spirit. The Holy Spirit is contrasted with the spirit of the cosmos,⁴ in the same way as Jesus Christ as our Lord is contrasted with the other "lords." He is the one and only Holy Spirit, in whom we are baptized, and of whom we drink.⁵ He is the gift of God.⁶ He is the source of those gifts which are distinctively spiritual—revelation, wisdom, knowledge, faith, healing, discernment of spirits, love, power, justification, sanctification, faith, peace, joy,

¹ Cp. Naville, Introduction, p. xix (Cobern, *The New Archeological Discoveries and their Bearing upon the New Testament*). For the use of the title *ὁ κύριος* as applied to an early Roman emperor, viz. Tiberius, cp. Report of a Lawsuit, A.D. 49 (Milligan, *Greek Papyri*, p. 49).

² Cp. Bousset, *Kyrios Christos*, S. 113.

³ Cp. Gal. iv. 6; 1 Cor. xv. 45; 2 Cor. iii. 17, 18; Phil. i. 19. Bousset finds in this "das Eigentümliche und Charakteristische der paulinischen Christologie"; cp. *Kyrios Christos*, S. 142.

⁴ Cp. 1 Cor. ii. 12.

⁵ Cp. 1 Cor. xii. 4, 11, 13; Eph. ii. 18, iv. 3, 4.

⁶ Cp. 1 Thess. iv. 8; Gal. iii. 5, 14; Rom. v. 5.

life, hope, freedom.¹ With the Holy Spirit all true Christians are in constant communion.² The Christians possess the Holy Spirit and are possessed by Him; they live in the Spirit, are alive through the Spirit, and produce the fruits of the Spirit.³ His presence is a necessity for real worship.⁴

It is He who ministers with glory,⁵ and is the guarantee of eternal life,⁶ eternal glory. The glory (ἡ δόξα) is, in measure, even at present, a possession of God's children.⁷ It is specially associated with Christ. Christ in us is the hope of glory.⁸ Christ Himself has already been received up into glory.⁹ In keeping with this, the full realisation of the glory lies in the future for us.¹⁰ It is the crowning reward of him who "worketh good,"¹¹ of those who seek glory.¹² The resurrection for all true believers will be a resurrection in glory.¹³ The resurrection body of the Risen Christ is "the body of His glory,"¹⁴ the body to which our own mortal bodies will

¹ Cp. 1 Thess. i. 5, 6; Gal. iii. 3, v. 5, 16, 17, 18, 22, 25; 1 Cor. ii. 4, 10, 11, 13, vi. 11, xii. 4 ff., xiv. 2; 2 Cor. i. 22, iii. 6, 17, v. 5; Rom. viii. 2, 15, xiv. 17, xv. 13, 16, 19, 30; Eph. iii. 5, 16; Col. i. 8; 1 Tim. iv. 1; 2 Tim. i. 14.

For the use of the word ἀπαβών (cp. 2 Cor. i. 22, v. 5; Eph. i. 14) in the papyri, e.g. the case of a woman who is selling a cow and gets an "earnest" (ἀπαβώνα) of a thousand drachmæ on the total purchase money, cp. Milligan, *Here and There among the Papyri*, p. 68. Kennedy holds that the νοῦς (which in St. Paul's thought is the λογικὴ ψυχὴ) "provides the basis for the operation of the Divine πνεῦμα"; cp. *St. Paul and the Mystery Religions*, p. 139.

² Cp. 2 Cor. xiii. 14; Phil. ii. 1.

³ Cp. 1 Cor. iii. 16, vii. 40, xii. 3; 2 Cor. iii. 3; Rom. viii. 4, 5, 9, 11, 13, 14, 16, 23, 26; Eph. ii. 22, v. 18, vi. 18. The body belongs to the Holy Spirit as to the Lord.

⁴ Cp. Phil. iii. 3; cp. the paramount position of Jesus Christ as Lord in the Christian cult. The Pneuma is "der im Gottesdienst der Gemeinde verehrte κύριος"; cp. Bousset, *Kyrios Christos*, S. 145.

⁵ Cp. 2 Cor. iii. 8.

⁶ Cp. Gal. vi. 8.

⁷ Cp. Rom. viii. 21; cp. Böhlig, *Die Geisteskultur von Tarsos*, S. 98.

⁸ Cp. Col. i. 27.

⁹ Cp. 1 Tim. iii. 16.

¹⁰ Cp. 2 Cor. iii. 18; Rom. viii. 18; Col. iii. 4.

¹¹ Cp. Rom. ii. 10.

¹² Cp. Rom. ii. 7.

¹³ Cp. 1 Cor. xv. 43.

¹⁴ The most probable explanation of St. Paul's conception of the σῶμα πνευματικόν is that he derived it partly from the traditional post-Resurrection appearances of Christ to the disciples and others who had known Him, and partly from ideas existing in his pagan environment. In the light of both of these he found an explanation of what happened to himself on the Damascus way.

in due time be conformed.¹ In our case eventually, as in Christ's, the body of the glory is the *σῶμα πνευματικόν*.

The Christians are those who have the Holy Spirit, that is, are the "pneumatikoi."² St. Paul recognised that there were powers of wickedness which were also of a pneumatic character,³ and he knew that the Jews claimed to be "pneumatikoi."⁴ The Law itself was "pneumatic."⁵

But while recognising all this, and even identifying Christ with the "spiritual rock that followed" of the Old Testament, the "pneumatikoi" of St. Paul's system can only be understood in the light of the personal Christ, Incarnate, Crucified, Risen, Exalted—the Christ who was at once "the Lord" and "the Pneuma." In keeping with this, the gospel itself and the gospel life are "pneumatic,"⁶ The blessings which the Christians enjoy,⁷ their wisdom and understanding,⁸ the very songs⁹ that they sing, are all "pneumatic." In the Christian, the pneumatic state supersedes the psychical, just as the Second spiritual Adam succeeds and supplants the First and psychical.¹⁰ The pneumatic life is progressive. The

¹ Cp. Phil. iii. 21. Kennedy holds that the *εἰκὼν* is practically equivalent to the *σῶμα πνευματικόν*, and the *εἰκὼν* expresses itself in *δόξα*; cp. *St. Paul and the Mystery Religions*, p. 189. In the LXX, *δόξα* usually translates *קֶבֶד*, from which source, we may be certain, St. Paul first became acquainted with the word, and its use is similar to his own. The word is associated by St. Paul with theophanies; cp. 2 Thess. i. 9; 2 Cor. iii. 8; Phil. iii. 21. In keeping with this is the close resemblance between St. Paul's conception of the *δόξα* and that of the Old Testament, where the *δόξα* is an evidence of the Divine Might or Energy. *הוֹר, תְּפָאָרָה, קָדֶר, נֶאֱוֹן, קֶדֶר*, and other rarer words, are translated *δόξα*. St. Paul's conception of the *δόξα* often resembles that of the rest of the New Testament. There is also characteristic of him a more concrete use, e.g. 1 Cor. ii. 7, xv. 40, 41; 2 Cor. iii. 18, iv. 4; Rom. i. 23, ii. 7, 10, viii. 18, 21, ix. 4. In regard to this more concrete understanding, St. Paul was perhaps influenced by Mithraism; cp. Böhlig, *Die Geisteskultur von Tarsos*, SS. 99 ff.

² Cp. Gal. vi. 1.

³ Cp. Eph. vi. 12.

⁴ Cp. 1 Cor. x. 3, 4. St. Paul identifies the "spiritual rock that followed" the children of Israel with Christ.

⁵ Cp. Rom. vii. 14.

⁶ Cp. 1 Cor. ix. 11, x. 3, xii. 1.

⁷ Cp. Eph. i. 3.

⁸ Cp. Col. i. 9.

⁹ Cp. Eph. v. 19; Col. iii. 16

¹⁰ Cp. 1 Cor. xv. 46.

goal towards which the Christian continually strives is to become "teleios" ("perfect").¹ The "perfect" are those who have become altogether "pneumatic."² It is an ideal state to be realised in the future.³

This "perfect" state, ultimately to be reached by the Christian, did not, however, amount to deification, in the teaching of St. Paul. He was ready, along with Jew⁴ and Gentile alike, to admit possession by the Spirit or by spirits.⁵ But no Christian, however spiritual he might become, could ever be Christ, the Lord, the Pneuma.⁶ In this respect, he differed radically from the contemporary pagan view.⁷

Altogether, in tracing the origin of St. Paul's conception of the Pneuma, and the pneumatic life through His indwelling, we have to recognise various contributory and formative elements. There is the influence of the LXX and of the later Jewish writings. Philo may not have directly moulded St. Paul's thought; but there is

¹ Cp. Col. i. 28, iv. 12.

² Cp. 1 Cor. ii. 6, xiv. 20; Phil. iii. 12, 15.

³ Cp. 1 Cor. xiii. 10; Eph. iv. 13. The word *τέλειος* appears in the later Stoics and in Philo, where it means the crowning stage of the good life which the philosopher is called upon to live. In the LXX it is used of bodily health, integrity of character, and obedience to God's Will.

⁴ Cp. the use of the *νοῦς* (רוח) in the LXX.

⁵ It is doubtful whether St. Paul held the current belief that the demons were present in the meat offered in the Pagan sacrifices; cp. 1 Cor. x. 20 ff. On the whole, perhaps, he did not; cp. 1 Cor. x. 25, 26.

⁶ Cp. Bousset, *Kyrios Christos*, S. 151. St. Paul's position may be regarded as standing midway between the older Jewish conception and the pagan idea of identification with God. To these older Jews, communion with God meant God drawing near to men—this and nothing more. "Nicht ein Eingehen Gottes in den Menschen und nicht ein Aufgehen des Menschen in Gott"; cp. Baudissin, "'Gott Schauen' in der alttestamentlichen Religion," (*Archiv für Religionswissenschaft*, Bd. xviii., 1915), S. 232.

⁷ In St. Paul's conception of the *τέλειος* the ethical element is emphasised. In the Hermetic literature there is, on the contrary, a purely mechanical appropriation of the *νοῦς*. St. Paul, in opposition to those who imagined that they were already perfect here on earth (cp. 1 Cor. iv. 8 ff.; Phil. iii. 12 ff.), maintained that the *τέλειοι* were those who had a full consciousness of their imperfections; but, having this, they increasingly persevered towards the attainment of perfection. Only on the other side could that goal be completely reached; cp. Deissner, *Paulus und die Mystik seiner Zeit*, pp. 35 ff., 75.

striking similarity between their respective conceptions of the Holy Spirit as a Divine gift.¹ Philo held that the Holy Spirit dwelt in good men like Moses, and was their constant companion.² Both Philo and St. Paul believed that the presence of the Holy Spirit was necessary for the perfecting of human character.³

That the doctrine of the Holy Spirit, though not in the fully developed form that we find in St. Paul, occupied a paramount place in the primitive Christian tradition is shown by the evidence alike of the Synoptic Gospels and of the Acts. In neither is the Pneuma expressly identified with the Risen Lord, as we find Him so identified in St. Paul. In the Synoptic Gospels He is the Spirit of God the Father, He is the Teacher who speaks through the preacher. He is intimately associated with the Virgin Birth. He descends upon Jesus, and leads Him up into the wilderness. He is the Holy Spirit, who is given to them who seek Him, so that they possess Him. He is intimately associated with Christian baptism.

In the Acts,⁴ He is the Holy Spirit who spoke by the mouth of David. It is the same Spirit of God who reveals Himself in the Church now. He is the gift of God, and the giver of many spiritual gifts to those who believe. The disciples receive Him, and are filled by Him.⁵ He is specially conferred by the solemn laying on of hands. He is a witness to Christ and His gospel,

¹ To Philo, it is sometimes the Divine *Noûs*, sometimes the Divine *Πνεῦμα*, who is given; cp. Bousset, *Kyrios Christos*, S. 138.

² Cp. Kennedy, *Philo's Contribution to Christianity*, pp. 191-2.

³ According to Philo, "erst ein höheres, von Gott frei geschenktes, nicht zur eigentlichen Ausrüstung des Menschen gehöriges Element muss hinzukommen, um dem Menschen seinen endgiltigen Wert zu verleihen"; cp. Bousset, *Kyrios Christos*, S. 138.

⁴ According to Harnack, the main purpose of the Acts was to demonstrate the power of the Spirit as shown in the works of the Apostles and in the spread of Christianity. When once the Canon of the New Testament was formed, the New Testament itself was regarded as the creation and the gift of the Holy Spirit; cp. Harnack, *The Origin of the New Testament*, pp. 115 ff.

⁵ "The general conception in Acts is that Christians normally receive the Spirit, but not that all their actions are inspired by it"; cp. Jackson and Lake, *Beginnings of Christianity*, pt. i. vol. ii. p. 194.

just as the disciples are. With Him is associated the power of God, and the sacred rite of baptism. There is at least one suggestion of the identification of Christ and the Holy Spirit.¹

The belief that God is Pneuma ("air," "breath") was deep rooted in pagan thought, and of ancient origin.² In the Mystery religions, both *πνεῦμα* and *νοῦς* are distinctively religious terms, and they mean practically the same thing.³ The *πνεῦμα* is the active principle of the divine life of God, at once substance and power. He is the free gift of God to the pious and good, through whom they obtain right knowledge and self-mastery. He enters into the hearts of the pious and gives them inspiration⁴ and life.⁵ Through Him, the pious soul

¹ Cp. Acts viii. 39. "Christians were inspired by the Spirit owing to their membership in the Ecclesia and its connection with the Lord Jesus"; cp. Jackson and Lake, *Beginnings of Christianity*, pt. i. vol. ii. p. 192.

² Anaximenes of Miletus held that air was the principle of all things—that "air is God"; cp. Aetius, i. 3, 4, 13. Archelaus of Athens, pupil of Anaxagoras, and teacher of Socrates, taught that God is air; cp. Aetius, i. 7, 15; cp. similarly, Diogenes, *Frag.* 5, Philemon, *Frag. incert.* 2. Zeus is the "infinite air on high"; cp. Euripides, *Frag.*, 941. "For Egyptians call breath (*πνεῦμα*) Zeus"; cp. Plutarch, *The Mysteries of Isis and Osiris*, xxxvi. 7. "Thoth is especially the representative of the Spirit, the Inner Reason of all things"; cp. Mead, *Thrice-Greatest Hermes*, p. 49; cp. Hermes, Mead, *op. cit.* pp. 84-5.

³ In the Hermetic literature, "der Nus ist eine göttliche, persönlich gedachte, supranaturale Kraft"; cp. Bousset, *Kyrios Christos*, S. 139. In the Hermetic literature, it is usually the *Νοῦς* that is spoken of. The Holy Spirit is female; cp. Mead, *Thrice-Greatest Hermes*, ii. p. 27.

⁴ Clemens thinks that *θεοπνευστος* (2 Tim. iii. 16) is of pagan origin; cp. *Primitive Christianity*, p. 350. "Come unto me, Lord Hermes, even as into women's wombs (come) babes"; cp. From an invocation to Lord Hermes, Mead, *Thrice-Greatest Hermes*, p. 86. "Come down into this fire; inspire it with (thy) holy spirit"; cp. From the Mystic Rite of the Flame, Mead, *Thrice-Greatest Hermes*, p. 93. "Thy divine countenance and thy most holy presence will I hide within the shrine of my heart" (from the prayer of Lucius to Isis; cp. Apuleius, xi. 25). "Blessed the soul that is most filled with him" (*i.e.* with Mind, the Good Daimon); cp. The Key of Thrice-Greatest Hermes, § 23, Mead, *Thrice-Greatest Hermes*, ii. p. 156; cp. Reitzenstein, *Poimandres*, S. 17 n.

⁵ Cp. the belief that by partaking of a god, the devotee shared in his life, *e.g.* in early Egyptian texts; cp. Dionysus-Zagreus, who is represented as a bull, torn into pieces, and eaten by the worshippers, with the result that they thereby share in the life itself of the god. "It is by Spirit that all things . . . in the Cosmos are made quick"; cp. The Perfect Sermon, xvi. §3.

enters into union with Deity. A great service in this respect was done by Orphism. While adhering to the Dionysiac ritual, it emphasised its central conception of union with the god, and demanded, as a condition of sharing in this, the practice of austere purity.¹ This union with deity could be obtained in several ways: by ecstasy and vision, by "god-seeing," by spiritual marriage,² and by voluntarily dying with the deity in order to be reborn again to a new life with him. But direct possession of the spirit of the deity was increasingly the most effectual way of achieving union with him.³

The Pauline conception of the *πνευματικός* is similar in some measure to that of the Mystery religions.⁴ According to Reitzenstein, the antithesis between *πνευματικός* and *ψυχικός* existed before St. Paul's day, and just as in St. Paul a clear distinction is drawn between those who have the Spirit and those who have not,⁵ so in the Mystery religions there are those who have the *Nous* and those who have not.⁶ Both the Pauline words *τέλειος* and *δόξα* occur in classical Greek and in the language of the Hermetic writings.⁷ The process by which the *δόξα* is

¹ Kennedy says: "In the various combinations which it [Orphism] would form, it must have been pervasively present in St. Paul's spheres of operation"; cp. *St. Paul and the Mystery Religions*, p. 18.

² Cp. Eph. v. 29 ff. "The chief of all the mysteries for Philo was, apparently, the Sacred Marriage"; cp. Mead, *Thrice-Greatest Hermes*, i. p. 216. "Die Schlange ist aber in den orientalischen Mysterien das Symbol der Gottheit. Sie kennzeichnet das Mysterium als Hochzeit"; cp. Böhlig, *Die Geisteskultur von Tarsos*, S. 79.

³ This did not apply to the city or State religions. These were not mystical, nor did they possess sacraments by which the human spirit could enter into union with deity; cp. Hatch, *The Pauline Idea of Faith* (Harvard Theological Studies), p. 68. But in the Mystery religions it is otherwise. "So ist der Fromme in Gott und Gott in ihm"; cp. Reitzenstein, *Poimandres*, S. 237.

⁴ Cp. Reitzenstein, *Die Hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen*, SS. 160 ff.; cp. 1 Cor. ii. 6 ff.

⁵ Cp. 1 Cor. ii. 11; Rom. viii. 9, 14, 15.

⁶ Cp. οὐ πάντες γὰρ ἄνθρωποι νοῦν ἔχουσιν (*Poimandres*, i. § 22). With St. Paul's *πνευματικός* we may compare the *θεῖος ἄνθρωπος* of the Mysteries, and the use of the rare word *μεταγεννηθῆναι* in the Mithras Mystery; cp. Reitzenstein, *Die Hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen*, S. 26.

⁷ Reitzenstein shows how *δόξα* and *δοξάζειν* had their true spiritual home in the Mystery religions. Böhlig suggests that the Pauline idea of the *δόξα* is derived from the Persian-Mithraic religion; cp. *Die*

reached in the Pauline scheme is of a different nature from that of the Mystery religions, where there is a gradual evolution through definite stages—animal, human, daimonic, and godlike—until at last the perfect glory (δόξα) is attained.¹ In St. Paul's teaching there is simply the emancipation out of the bondage of the psychic state into the freedom of the spiritual, and then a gradual progressive forward movement of a spiritual nature, until finally, in the future state, the glorified perfect life is reached. Similarly, in St. Paul's thought there is no such thing as actual deification of those possessed of the Spirit.

While, in St. Paul's conception, theology and morality were inseparably bound up together, and personal purity was a demand of the Christian life, there is not in St. Paul's teaching anything of the Orphic doctrine that "consecration,"² involving perfect purity, ultimately issued in divinity. Neither do we find in St. Paul that which is found in the Mystery religions, the view that "seeing God" was equivalent to making one identical with God;³ nor is there anything of that striving after deification as the ultimate goal, which was characteristic of later Greek piety.⁴

Altogether, in estimating St. Paul's conception of the πνεῦμα, we must take into account a threefold influence: the Jewish (LXX), early Christian tradition, and pagan thought. Distinctive of St. Paul is his purer,

Geisteskultur von Tarsos, S. 99. Cp. the words of a magician's prayer to Isis, δόξασόν με ὡς ἐδόξασα τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ νιοῦ σου "Ἰσιν (Wessely, *Zauberpap.* ii. p. 37, l. 512), and John xvii. 4 ff.

¹ Cp. Mead, *Thrice-Greatest Hermes*, ii. p. 165.

² δσιότης was "the keynote of Orphic faith, the goal of Orphic ritual." The old underworld rites were called δσια. δσιῶ was the word used "to describe the state of those who are fully initiated"; cp. J. E. Harrison, *Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Religion*, pp. 478, 505, 506. παραγίνομαι αὐτὸς ἐγὼ ὁ Νοῦς τοῖς δσίοις . . . ; cp. Poimandres, i. § 22. Mithra in Cappadocia is the θεὸς δσιος; cp. Böhlig, *Die Geisteskultur von Tarsos*, S. 105.

³ Cp. Baudissin, "'Gott Schauen' in der alttestamentlichen Religion" (*Archiv für Religionswissenschaft*, Bd. xviii., 1915), S. 232 n.

⁴ τοῦτ' ἐστὶ τὸ ἀγαθὸν τέλος τοῖς γνῶσιν ἐσχηκόσι θεωτῆναι; cp. Poimandres, § 26.

loftier, and more comprehensive conception of the Holy Spirit ; his identification of the Holy Spirit with Jesus Christ, at once the pre-existent Christ, the historical Jesus, and the Risen Lord ; and the entire absence, as one would expect in St. Paul the Jew, of anything of the nature of defecation through the Holy Spirit.

CHAPTER IV

ST. PAUL AND THE MYSTIC WAY

IN this chapter we purpose dealing with the mystical element in St. Paul, and would seek to discover the origins of his conception of mystery and of the mystic way, and to show that, while he did not need to go to paganism, either for the word "mystery" or for the mystical element in the religious life, nevertheless, inasmuch as he was surrounded by a pagan environment which was permeated by the spirit of mystery, he could not fail to be influenced thereby.

The element of mystery in the religious life is real, it might even be said to be essential to all truly living religious experience. But it is hard to define. It is essentially an inner experience and involves an apprehension of the divine, but not through mere sense or even rational thinking. It implies immediate contact with the Divine, and aims at ever fuller union with Deity. It means a progressive development of the spiritual part of man in direct intercourse with God.¹

¹ Deissmann, while defining "mysticism" as direct intercourse with Deity, distinguishes between two kinds of mysticism: (1) the mysticism in which what is regarded as the direct action of God produces a reaction towards God; (2) the mysticism where the mystic regards his communion with God as his own action, which produces in turn a reaction on the part of Deity. The former is "reacting mysticism," the latter "acting mysticism." He regards St. Paul as a classical type of the reacting mystic (the religion of grace). Deissmann holds that St. Paul waged a severe battle against acting mysticism (which finds its expression in works of personal merit); cp. *The Religion of Jesus and the Faith of Paul*, pp. 195-9.

Rudolf Otto finds that in mysticism there is first of all "Aufmerksamkeitsrichtung durch den Willen." Then comes a state of "Versunkenheit in den Gegenstand," and a condition of "Entselbstung." There follows the experience where the mystic feels himself

Sometimes the mystic is contrasted with the thinker.¹ In St. Paul we have the two combined. No student of St. Paul could fail to be impressed alike by the profundity and originality of his thinking. As little could he fail to recognise the powerful mystical element in the apostle. His mysticism is shown in his use of the word "mystery," in his conception of the sacraments, and, most of all, in this fact, that his life as a Christian is an impressive example of the mystic way.

The use of the "mystery" in a religious sense probably goes back to the very roots of religion.² Whatever the original signification of the word may have been, it had gone through a long history of development before St. Paul's day. "Mystery," and the mystical elements associated with the word, had a great influence on Christianity from the first.

It was as a Mystery religion that Christianity was accepted in Europe, and St. Paul himself clearly recognised that, from one point of view, Christianity was a Mystery religion.³

to be one with the object (der Gegenstand), the state of "ecstasis." Beginning with a concentrated effort of the will, the mystic reaches the condition where he feels, sees, and originates new ideas, without the conscious exercise of his will; cp. "Zum Verhältnisse von mystischer und gläubiger Frömmigkeit" (*Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche*, 1922), pp. 257-9.

¹ Glover says that "the progress in religion has been made at every stage by the thinkers more than by the mystics, and incomparably more by both than by the adherents of cults"; cp. *Progress in Religion*, p. 13. The last statement is certainly true. The former is at least doubtful. In any case, the greatest progress in religion has been due to men like St. Paul who were both thinkers and mystics.

² Miss Harrison, in keeping with her theory that the key to ancient Greek religion is not sacrifice but purification, thinks that it is possible that the root of the word "mystery" is connected with *mýros*, a "pollution," so that originally a "mystery" would be a purification; cp. *Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Religion*, pp. 154, 162.

In the epic of Gilgamesh, Ut-napishtim says to Gilgamesh: "I will reveal to thee, O Gilgamesh, a hidden word, and the purpose of the gods will I declare to thee"; cp. Frazer, *Folklore in the Old Testament*, i. p. 113.

³ "Christianity . . . was always, at least in Europe, a Mystery religion"; cp. Lake, *Earlier Epistles of St. Paul*, p. 215; cp. Inge, *Outspoken Essays*, p. 227. Loisy thinks that it was largely due to St. Paul that Christianity became a Mystery religion; cp. Goguel, *Revue de l'histoire des religions*, 1920, pp. 107-8.

It is always difficult to distinguish between similarity of ideas in Christianity and in the Mystery religions, and direct formative influences exercised by the Mystery religions on Christianity. Without drawing hard and fast lines between these two, the following are to be noted. The divine origin of the human soul is implied in both.¹ There could have been no gospel of forgiveness and reconciliation if man had not originally been the child of God.

The Mystery religions, as truly as Christianity, claim to possess an immediate, and, at the same time, a progressive, revelation straight from God Himself; and in both cases we find that revelation specially conferred on those who were in the ecstatic state.² Both alike claim that their revelation is the primitive religion.³ To St. Paul the gospel is the Will and Purpose of God from all eternity, now made known through Jesus Christ, the Incarnate Son.

The Mystery religions, like Christianity, are international, making their appeal to all men.⁴ It has to be remembered, however, in this connection, that a similar claim had been made by Judaism.

In both we find a kind of soul-anxiety and the yearning of the heart for God and immortality.⁵ In both an

¹ "But my race is of Heaven (alone)"; cp. Orphic Tablets (the Petelia tablet), which Gilbert Murray dates fourth century B.C.; cp. Harrison, *Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Religion*, pp. 661-2. "For I also avow me that I am of your blessed race"; cp. Compagno tablet (a) and (b), *op. cit.* pp. 668, 670. "Child of Zeus"; cp. the Cæcilia Secundina tablet, of which the date is the second century A.D., or possibly the first century A.D. (Comparetti); cp. *op. cit.* p. 673.

² Cp. Reitzenstein, *Die Hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen*, S. 18. For points of difference between St. Paul's conception of the ecstatic state and that of the Mystery religions, cp. Deissner, *Paulus und die Mystik seiner Zeit*, S. 90.

³ The "Urreligion"; cp. Reitzenstein, *Die Hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen*, S. 15.

⁴ The Eleusinian mysteries were international; cp. Glover, *Progress in Religion*, p. 90. "Alle Mysterienreligionen des Altertums geben sich in hellenistischer Zeit als für alle Menschen bestimmt"; cp. Reitzenstein, *Die Hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen*, S. 15.

⁵ "We should expect the general result of all these religious impulses to have been to familiarise the average mind with a more anxious anticipation, or a more hopeful and exalted conception, of the ultimate

effort is made to secure a happy fraternal and social intercourse in this present life through the practical realisation of a religious ideal. In both we find a ritual of initiation, and holy communion rites used as a means of securing a happy immortality, and emphatic recognition of the supreme importance of the future life. In both we find a moral earnestness, and a spiritual depth and certainty, which are wanting in the ordinary State religions. Both were essentially democratic and popular, making their way from the lower strata of the people upwards, appealing to sentiment rather than to reason, and seeking to meet the needs and aspirations of the individual soul rather than to impress men's minds by the grandeur of their public ritual.¹ In both there is a clamant need felt for a mediator between the soul of man and God, and, as Böhlig points out, it is noteworthy that this was particularly characteristic of Tarsus.²

Some would recognise that the Mystery religions influenced Christianity definitely in the following ways : by their conception of the successive ages of the world, and by their idea of the world as passing away ; by the legend of a god who died and rose again for human salvation ; by their ethical ideals, chastity, sobriety, and mutual helpfulness (the Essenes) ; by the use of allegorical interpretation of scriptures (Orphics, Essenes) ; by their methods of secret propaganda ; and by the more or less autocratic jurisdiction of the leaders, armed with threats of eternal damnation on the heretic and disobedient, over the community.

No part of primitive Christianity could fail to come into touch with the Mystery religions in some form, or destiny of the soul " ; cp. Farnell, *Greek Hero Cults and Ideas of Immortality*, p. 389 ; cp. Glover, *Progress in Religion*, p. 90, referring to Orphism. Speaking of the Christianity of the first centuries, Reinach says it " a été fortement imprégné d'orphisme " ; cp. *Cultes et religions*, ii. p. 83 ; cp. Matt. xvi. 26.

¹ Cp. Cumont, *Les Religions orientales dans le paganisme romain*, p. 49 ; cp. Cumont, *Les Mystères de Mithra*, pp. 63, 70, 200 (Mithraism was largely propagated by the import of slaves and the transference of soldiers).

² Cp. *Die Geisteskultur von Tarsos*, S. 18 ; cp. Acts xiv. 11 ff.

fail to be influenced thereby. But, alike because of his temperament, his education in Tarsus, and the rich experience of the world of men which St. Paul acquired in his after life, we may expect that he was in a special degree influenced by these religions. There is much to show that this was the case. It is not too much to suppose that even in his pre-conversion days St. Paul had leanings towards mysticism.¹

While it may be legitimately claimed that, on the whole, the Jewish mind is alien to mysticism,² it cannot be denied that there is a mystical element alike in the Prophets, the Psalms, and the Doresche Reschumoth.³ We may readily believe that this purely Jewish mysticism had an influence on St. Paul's mind in the earlier part of his life.

But the chief contribution to the mystical side of St. Paul's character and life most probably came from Hellenism. It was at Antioch that Christianity first came into decisive contact with the Greek Mystery religions.⁴ From that beginning, the influence of the Mystery religions on the Christian communities which had originated on Hellenistic ground⁵ manifestly grew, particularly in the mystical conceptions of the second birth, death and resurrection with the once dead but now risen and exalted Christ, and of the "pneumatic" man.⁶

¹ Cp. Reitzenstein, *Die Hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen*, S. 199.

² Cp. Inge, *Christian Mysticism*, p. 39.

³ What mysticism there was in Judaism was mainly eschatological, and did not have to do with the individual as such. In the primitive church at Jerusalem, the note emphasised is the eschatological. In St. John's writings, at the end of the first period, the note emphasised is the mystical in the fuller sense of the word. St. Paul occupies a position between these two; cp. Schmidt, "Eschatologie und Mystik im Urchristentum" (*Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 1922, Bd. xxi.), S. 280. In St. Paul, mysticism is not merely eschatological. It is also a matter of the present experience of the individual Christian (e.g. Christ in the believers, who as individuals possess the Holy Spirit, which means grace and power to them).

⁴ Cp. Weiss, *Das Urchristentum*, S. 577.

⁵ Kennedy has shown that "in all the main centres of his missionary operations, the Apostle Paul must have been brought into contact with the influences of the Mystery Religions"; cp. *St. Paul and the Mystery Religions*, p. 115.

⁶ Cp. Weiss, *Das Urchristentum*, S. 478.

It is probable that St. Paul was not directly familiar with the literature of the Mystery religions; but there can be no doubt that he had full cognizance of the technical terms of their literature and ritual, and in a general sense breathed the atmosphere of the mysteries.¹ This is shown particularly by his epistles to the Corinthians, and by the epistles of his imprisonment, which had to do with communities in which, as we have reason to believe, the Mystery brotherhoods were particularly strong. Of these Mystery brotherhoods many of his converts must at one time have been members.

There must at all times have been a danger, of which St. Paul would be aware, lest these pagan Mysteries might drag Christianity down to their level. But St. Paul was a God-sent apostle who was singularly well equipped to maintain the pristine purity of the Christian faith and practice, and so to spiritualise and exalt the Mystery terms as to make them serviceable in the interests of the Christian gospel.²

For St. Paul, familiarity with Mystery ideas and language must have been an experience of the earliest days in Tarsus.³ St. Paul's native place, which was "no mean city," alike as a great meeting-place of the Orient and Occident, as a *πρώτη μητρόπολις*, and as the parent of a series of brilliant men—philosophers, artists, and physicians—also played an important part in the history

¹ A striking parallel to St. Paul's case is found in Philo, who, though he condemns the pagan mysteries (*de spec. leg.* i. 319), not only shows his acquaintance with their nature (*de cherub.* 48; *de gig.* 54; *leg. all.* iii. 100), but has embodied in his system, along with Judaism and Greek philosophy, "ein starker Einschlag hellenistisch-orientalische mysteriöser Frömmigkeit"; cp. Bousset, *Kyrios Christos*, S. xi; cp. *The Odes of Solomon*, marked by mystic thought and phraseology similar to that of the Gospel of St. John.

² The following passages are of special interest as showing the influence of the Mystery religions on St. Paul: Gal. ii. 19, iv. 19, vi. 14; 1 Cor. ii. 5, v. 3, xv. 53 ff. (cp. the *παλιγγενεσία*, the "rebirth" of the mysteries); 2 Cor. iv. 11, 16; Rom. vi. 4, 6, vii. 4, 6, viii. 3, 5, 9, 11, 29; Phil. iii. 21; Col. ii. 11 f., 20, iii. 3, 9, 10.

³ "Auch Paulus hat sie (die Mystik), aus dem Gebiet seiner Heimat als Erbteil empfangen"; cp. Böhlig, *Die Geisteskultur von Tarsos*, SS. 80, 168.

of religion. Essentially a city of mixed races, we should expect to find a syncretism of varied faiths in it.¹ The name Tarsus is probably to be derived from the name of the god Tarhu.² While the gods of Tarsus have usually Greek names, they are in themselves of native or Oriental character.³ The entire world of the gods dwelling in the highest regions were called *θεοὶ ἐπουράνιοι*. The term *οἱ ἐπουράνιοι* had become, in the syncretism of Tarsus, a religious formula. Corresponding to the *θεοὶ ἐπουράνιοι* were the *θεοὶ καταχθόνιοι*.⁴

According to the coins of the Persian, Hellenic, and Roman periods, the highest god of Tarsus was the Baal-Tarz or Zeus. The use of the one name or the other depended on whether his Oriental-Syriac or Occidental-Greek character preponderated. The active deity, however, was Sandan⁵ or Herakles. From the evidence of names, Böhlig infers that the Sandan cult, at one time, largely prevailed in Lydia.⁶ In view of the annual death⁷ and resurrection of Sandan, we have probably to recognise in him originally a vegetation god.⁸ It is

¹ In historical times, there were two groups of people located in Cilicia: an aboriginal, and the Ḫatti, who had come into the land. Greek thought and culture were introduced later, and grafted on to the older Oriental life. The Oriental element remained the kernel. At the beginning of the Empire (Augustus), the Greek element was the more active, the leading force; but, underneath the surface, the Oriental element was holding on tenaciously; cp. Böhlig, *Die Geisteskultur von Tarsos*, SS. 11-14. Böhlig distinguishes between three epochs in the history of Tarsus: 1. Anatolian; 2. Assyrian-Persian; 3. Hellenic-Roman. Corresponding to each of these, there was (a) an exalted godhead; (b) an active godhead:

1. (a) The unknown god of Boghaz Keui; (b) Sandan-Teschup.

2. (a) Baal Tarz; (b) Sandan.

3. (a) Zeus; (b) Sandan-Herakles. Cp. S. 57.

2 "s" and "h" were interchangeable letters; cp. Böhlig, *Die Geisteskultur von Tarsos*, SS. 10, 11 and n. 11.

³ Cp. Böhlig, *op. cit.* S. 16. Gunkel would identify Tarhu with Terah; cp. *The Legends of Genesis*, p. 119.

⁴ Cp. Eph. i. 3, 20, ii. 6, iii. 10, vi. 12; Phil. ii. 10.

⁵ For various derivations of the name, compare Böhlig, *Die Geisteskultur von Tarsos*, SS. 24 ff.; cp. Eisler, *Weltenmantel u. Himmelszelt*, S. 166 n. 3.

⁶ Cp. *Die Geisteskultur von Tarsos*, S. 54.

⁷ For the honour paid to Herakles when he died, cp. Dion of Prusa, *de virtute*, §§ 28, 34.

⁸ Cp. Böhlig, *Die Geisteskultur von Tarsos*, SS. 45 ff.

possible, perhaps probable, that Sandan is of Hittite origin and to be identified with the god Teschup.¹ In any case the Greeks identified Herakles with the Sandan of Tarsus, and simply transferred to the latter their own myths concerning Herakles.² While this was done by the Greeks, we cannot suppose that their action had any influence on the Oriental population, to whom Sandan, pure and simple, remained their own native god; and while the cult of the vegetation god Sandan was probably not to be regarded as a fully articulated Mystery religion, it might well be regarded as having the crude beginnings of such.³ There are striking similarities between the annual festival of Herakles at Tarsus and the rites of the Mystery religions.

Intimately associated with Sandan-Herakles at Tarsus are the gods Apollo,⁴ Perseus, and Hermes.⁵

Böhlig thinks it probable that certain Mysteries akin to the Eleusinian existed in Tarsus in the early days of the Empire, and that, while direct evidence is wanting as regards the presence of the Mithraic Mystery in Tarsus in St. Paul's time, the probability is that it was already

¹ Cp. the figure of the god in the procession at Iasily Kaya, which strongly resembles the typical representation of Sandan.

² From the fourth century B.C. onwards, Herakles appears on the coins of Tarsus. Herakles was called *θεός* in St. Paul's time; cp. Dion of Prusa, *de regno*, i. § 58.

³ "Der Schritt von der Anbetung der Vegetationsdämonen zur Anbetung des Mysteriengottes ist nicht gross"; cp. Böhlig, *Die Geisteskultur von Tarsos*, S. 46.

⁴ Like the Hittite god Teschup, Apollo is represented with the trident in his hand. According to Waddell, the "Tascio" or "Tascif" of early British coins is to be identified with the "Tash-ub" of the Hitto-Sumerians; cp. *Phœnician Origin of Britons, Scots, and Anglo-Saxons*, p. 339.

⁵ Hermes appears only on late coins of Tarsus. Herakles is *ὁ ἀρχηγός ὑμῶν*; cp. Dion, *Tarsica prior*, § 47; cp. Acts iii. 15, v. 31. Other deities of Tarsus were: Triptolemos, Dionysus (*Ἀρχεβάκχος* and *Καλλικάρπος*), the *Ταρσὴν Μήτηρ*, Athena, Nemesis, Tyche, Aphrodite (her head appears on Tarsus coins, and, on the reverse side, the head of Herakles), Artemis, Arethusa, Demeter, Hygeia; cp. Böhlig, *Die Geisteskultur von Tarsos*, SS. 64 ff. The important part played by Dionysus in the life of the Mystery societies has particularly to be kept in mind; cp. Poland, *Geschichte des Griechischen Vereinswesens*, SS. 198 (Thessalonica, Philippi), 199 (Ephesus), 200 n. (Tarsus).

known there.¹ The Mystery of Mithras will be dealt with more fully later on.

Already we have had occasion to refer to St. Paul's understanding of "mystery." For the sake of clearness, it is necessary at this point to deal with it somewhat more fully. He recognises the use of the word, generally speaking, in a good and bad sense. If there is "the mystery of God,"² there is also "the mystery of lawlessness."³ There is associated with the "mystery," at some time or other, a hidden or secret element; but usually that hidden element is now, under the providence of God, revealed.⁴ It is a revelation of God's will, specially in the redemption of Christ.⁵ It is a revelation of God's purpose towards men, particularly in Christ and the gospel.⁶ It is something revealed in St. Paul's own case.⁷ There is "the mystery of the faith";⁸ "the mystery of godliness";⁹ the "mystery of Christ and of the Church";¹⁰ the "mystery" which has to do with last things.¹¹ The Christian preachers were "stewards of the mysteries of God."¹²

Now, while we may be sure that St. Paul's first acquaintance with the "mystery" was derived from Judaism, it did not end there. As we have seen, both the word, and a great deal of what it stood for, was in the very air of Tarsus. The Jews of Tarsus, like the other Jews of the whole Diaspora, made their own contribution to the mystical eschatological element. They all looked forward eagerly to the ultimate return to Palestine. It is natural to suppose that it was in large measure from

¹ Cilicia was the first part of the Empire to come under the influence of the worship of Mithras. Ahura Mazda appears on coins of Tarsus in the time of Taribazos (386-380 B.C.); cp. Böhlig, *Die Geisteskultur von Tarsos*, S. 90.

² Cp. 1 Cor. ii. 1, 7.

³ Cp. 2 Thess. ii. 7.

⁴ Cp. 1 Cor. ii. 7, xiv. 2; Eph. iii. 4, 5, 9; Col. i. 26.

⁵ Cp. Eph. i. 9.

⁶ Cp. Rom. xi. 25, xvi. 25; Eph. iii. 4, 5; Col. i. 27, ii. 2.

⁷ Cp. Eph. iii. 3, vi. 20; Col. i. 26, iv. 3.

⁸ Cp. 1 Tim. iii. 9.

⁹ Cp. 1 Tim. iii. 16.

¹⁰ Cp. Eph. v. 32.

¹¹ Cp. 1 Cor. xv. 51.

¹² Cp. 1 Cor. iv. 1.

this source that St. Paul imbibed the spirit of the eschatological mystic which permeates his thought, and it is just possible that from this he derives his use and understanding of "Maranatha."¹

The influence of the Mysteries, whether derived from Judaism or from the Pagan and Jewish environment of his native town Tarsus, or from his contact with the bigger Gentile world of the later years, is a dominant influence, manifesting itself in St. Paul's language, ideas, understanding of the sacraments, and above all in the mystic life of the Christian man. It was an influence already beginning to be felt in the Christian Church before St. Paul became a Christian. In the Book of Acts we hear of baptism in the name of Jesus Christ associated with the gift of the Holy Spirit.² The believers receive the Holy Spirit,³ and are filled with Him.⁴ He is to them a source of comfort⁵ and of guidance.⁶

In St. Paul's letters we find a far richer and fuller testimony to the mystical element, alike in his conception of the sacraments⁷ and in his entire presentation of the Christian life. As he expressly identifies Christ the Risen Lord with the Holy Spirit, it is not necessary in our treatment of this subject to draw hard and fast lines between what is said of the one and of the other.

In baptism, the Christian believer mystically dies, is buried, and rises again, with Christ.⁸ There is mystical participation of the body and blood of Christ in the Lord's Supper.⁹ In the Christian experience, the Spirit who is

¹ Cp. Böhlig, *Die Geisteskultur von Tarsos*, S. 147. Till long after the Exile, the eschatology of Yahwism had to do with the nation, not with the individual; cp. Charles, *Eschatology*, p. 18. In the Synoptic Gospels, the kingdom of God embodies a strong eschatological element; cp. Charles, *Eschatology*, pp. 370 ff.

² Cp. Acts i. 5, ii. 38, x. 47, xi. 15, 16, xix. 5.

³ Cp. Acts viii. 15, 17, 18, 19, x. 44, xix. 6.

⁴ Cp. Acts ii. 4, iv. 8, 31, vi. 3, vii. 55, ix. 17, xi. 24, xiii. 9, 52.

⁵ Cp. Acts ix. 31. ⁶ Cp. Acts xvi. 6.

⁷ "The essential characteristic of the Mysteries was, of course, inherent in the sacraments from the very first"; cp. Wernle, *Beginnings of Christianity*, ii. p. 127.

⁸ Cp. Gal. ii. 20, iii. 27; 1 Cor. xii. 13; Rom. vi. 3.

⁹ Cp. 1 Cor. x. 16, xi. 23 ff., xii. 13.

Christ is freely given and readily accepted and cherished.¹ The Christians put on Christ like a garment.² The Spirit of Christ lives in the Christian and fills his heart,³ and is to the Christian the sure "hope of glory."⁴ As Christ is mystically in us, so are we as Christians mystically in Him. The entire Christian life is lived in the Lord, a continual fellowship with Him and in Him.⁵ Through the mystical union with Christ and His Spirit many valuable gifts are bestowed and received,⁶ and worthy fruits are produced.⁷ Christians are the body of Christ, and Christ is the head of every Christian man.⁸ The Holy Spirit operates⁹ in the Christian man and guides¹⁰ him, testifying with his spirit.¹¹ In the mystical life of the Spirit, the Christian is made a sharer in the kingdom of God,¹² is abundantly helped,¹³ possesses the earnest of the Spirit and is sealed by Him,¹⁴ obtains revelation through Him,¹⁵ speaks¹⁶ and prays¹⁷ through Him. Through mystical union with Christ and His Spirit,

¹ Cp. 1 Thess. iv. 8; Gal. iii. 3, 5, 14; 1 Cor. vii. 40; Rom. v. 5, viii. 9; Phil. i. 19; Col. ii. 6.

² Cp. Rom. xiii. 14.

³ Cp. Gal. ii. 20, iv. 19; 1 Cor. iii. 16; Rom. viii. 11, 12; Eph. v. 18; 2 Tim. i. 14.

⁴ Cp. Col. i. 27.

⁵ Cp. 1 Thess. iii. 8; Gal. v. 16; 1 Cor. i. 9, 30, iv. 10, 15, vii. 22, 39, ix. 2, xi. 11; 2 Cor. i. 21, ii. 14, 17, vi. 6, xii. 18, 19, xiii. 14; Rom. viii. 4, 5, 9, ix. 1, xvi. 3, 7, 9, 10; Eph. i. 1, 3, iii. 6, 21, iv. 1, 13, 15, 17, vi. 1, 10, 21; Phil. i. 1, iv. 7; Col. i. 2, 4, 28; 2 Tim. iii. 12; Philem. 8.

To be a Christian meant to St. Paul being always and essentially in Christ, *i.e.* in the Holy Spirit, a "pneumatikos." Being this, he felt himself to be always in the condition of undoubting and unswerving faith in God and in Jesus Christ, who was at once God and the Holy Spirit to him. Having communion and the life of faith, he had also a hope which could never be dimmed, no matter what experience he underwent. St. Paul was conscious at once of present possession, and had the conviction that richer blessings would surely come, *e.g.* fuller communion, deliverance from the transitoriness of life in the body, the full spiritual body, and the glory of seeing God face to face. Communion with the Holy Spirit did not mean that he was sinless; but it meant that the power of sin was broken in proportion as he was possessed, led, and guided by the Holy Spirit.

⁶ Cp. 1 Cor. xii. 9.

⁷ Cp. Gal. v. 22; Eph. ii. 10.

⁸ Cp. 1 Cor. xi. 3, xii. 27; Eph. v. 23.

⁹ Cp. 1 Cor. xii. 11; Eph. iii. 21.

¹⁰ Cp. Gal. v. 18; Rom. viii. 14.

¹² Cp. Rom. xiv. 17.

¹⁴ Cp. 2 Cor. i. 22, v. 5; Eph. i. 13.

¹⁶ Cp. 1 Cor. xii. 3.

¹¹ Cp. Rom. viii. 16.

¹³ Cp. Rom. viii. 26.

¹⁵ Cp. Eph. iii. 5.

¹⁷ Cp. Eph. vi. 18.

victory is obtained over the lower nature, and the body henceforth belongs to the Lord.¹ The mystical life is a life of freedom,² justification,³ sanctification,⁴ truth,⁵ love,⁶ and unity.⁷ It is a life of constant living and dying with Christ,⁸ a life wherein the Christian is not only a new creation, but is continually being renewed, and undergoing a transformation from glory to glory.⁹ It is a life which is not ended by physical death, for the departed are only asleep in Jesus.¹⁰ It is a life which will be eternal.¹¹

To St. Paul, the way of Christ was a mystic way, a way which Christ Himself had trod in the days of His flesh.¹² Not only was St. Paul one of the pioneer discoverers of that way, but few have gone as far along the track of it as he did. At the same time, St. Paul's mysticism is, as compared with that of St. John, of a transitional character.¹³ With the post-Pauline development of mysticism we have not, however, to do. Our interest is in the form in which it presents itself in St. Paul, and in the sources from which he drew his inspiration. These sources were, in part, derived from Judaism, in part, from Christ who Himself trod the mystic way, and, in measure, were due to the pagan environment in which St. Paul was born, and in which he lived his mortal life.

¹ Cp. Gal. v. 6, 17, 24; 1 Cor. vi. 13, 15, 17, 19; Rom. viii. 10, 13; Eph. ii. 21; Phil. i. 20; Col. ii. 11.

² Cp. 2 Cor. iii. 17.

³ Cp. 1 Cor. vi. 11; Rom. viii. 1.

⁴ Cp. 2 Thess. ii. 13; 1 Cor. i. 2.

⁵ Cp. Rom. ix. 1.

⁶ Cp. Col. i. 8.

⁷ Cp. Rom. xii. 5; Eph. iv. 3.

⁸ Cp. 2 Cor. iv. 10, 11; Rom. vi. 8, 11, vii. 4, viii. 10; Eph. ii. 5; Phil. i. 21; Col. ii. 20, iii. 3, 4; 2 Tim. i. 1.

⁹ Cp. 2 Cor. iii. 18, v. 17; Tit. iii. 5.

¹⁰ Cp. 1 Thess. iv. 16; 1 Cor. xv. 18.

¹¹ Cp. 1 Thess. iv. 14, 17; Gal. vi. 8; 1 Cor. xv. 22; Rom. vi. 23; Eph. ii. 6; Col. iii. 1.

¹² While there may not be, as has been maintained, adequate materials to provide a full biography of Jesus in the ordinary sense of the word, Miss Underhill is right in affirming that sufficient materials do exist "for a history of His psychological development"; cp. *The Mystic Way*, p. 78.

¹³ "Und endlich ist die Christusmystik des Paulus die erste Etappe auf dem Weg zur Gottesmystik, aus dem *ἐν Χριστῷ* des Paulus wird das Aus-Gottgeboren-sein des Johannes"; cp. Bousset, *Kyrios Christos*, S. 173.

Mysticism, in some shape or other, had long found a place in the world of men, and had sprung into life in more than one quarter.¹ Though the Egyptians, so far as we know, had no word which was exactly equivalent to "mysteries" in their language, they had at least the thing itself.² The influence of Egypt on Greece goes back to a very early date. The Pharaohs of the Eighteenth Dynasty dominated the coasts of Syria, the coasts and islands of southern Asia Minor, and the archipelago of the Ægean Sea ;³ and Egyptian settlers introduced the cult of Isis, who, under the name of Hera or Demeter, was worshipped as the goddess of agriculture, of the fertility of Nature and the human race, and as the foundress of laws protecting marriage and the family.⁴ In Egypt itself, the doctrinal content of the Alexandrian Mysteries remained purely Egyptian.⁵

The Mysteries of Egypt are specially associated with the names of Osiris, Isis, Horus, Serapis, and Thoth. Osiris was at once the god of fecundity and the lord of the underworld. He was identified with the sun.⁶ His cult not only exercised a great influence on the religious

¹ The religions of Attis, Isis, Serapis, Cybele, and Mithras are typical examples of Mystery religions. In classical times, the principal Mystery religions belonged to the Orphic societies, and to those of Eleusis, Samothrace, and Andania. The Mysteries present considerable variety in type, but the following were characteristic marks : (1) they were generally private and voluntary, although there were exceptions, *e.g.* the State Mysteries at Eleusis ; (2) they were deeply interested in the future life ; (3) they usually demanded a measure of personal purity ; (4) they offered mystical union with the deity through sacramental rites.

² The word "amakhon" and "ma-khroon" are not the exact equivalent of "initiate," but they imply much of the relationship towards deity which is involved in the word "initiate" ; cp. Foucart, *Les Mystères d'Éleusis*, pp. 78, 79.

³ Cp. the stele of Ammon found at Karnak.

⁴ Cp. Foucart, *Les Mystères d'Éleusis*, p. 39. "Schon in der zweiten Hälfte des 4. Jahrhunderts gibt es im Piräus Αἰγύπτιοι" ; cp. Poland, *Geschichte des Griechischen Vereinswesens*, S. 81. Herodotus (bk. ii. c. 50) affirms that the names of almost all the gods worshipped by the Greeks came from Egypt.

⁵ Cp. Cumont, *Les Religions orientales dans le paganisme romain*, p. 120.

⁶ Cp. *ibid.* p. 109.

life of Egypt, but, in course of time, extended to the Greco-Roman world.¹

Closely associated with Osiris was the goddess Isis. According to Plutarch, she was "the feminine [principle] of Nature."² She was a goddess at once of the land of the living and of the realm of the dead, the goddess of agriculture, of civilisation, and the kindly protectress of the initiated after death. While sharing with Osiris the rule of the realm of the dead, she did not sit at his side. The reason for this was that, unlike Osiris, she had not undergone death herself. Living in the world of living men, she was able to guarantee a happy hereafter to her own initiates in the world where Osiris reigned.³ She was also a sea-goddess, the patroness deity of seamen.⁴ She was a goddess who guaranteed to her initiates protection, a genuine rebirth, for example in the case of Apuleius, and blessedness in the Beyond. Alike in Egypt and, later on, in the Greco-Roman world, her cult was held in very high honour. In the former, at the close of the Ptolemaic period, she and her son Horus "were, after Osiris, perhaps the two most venerated" deities.⁵

¹ Herodotus (bk. ii. c. 48) refers to the resemblance between the cults of Osiris and Dionysus; cp. Cumont, *Les Religions orientales dans le paganisme romain*, p. 93. Plutarch (second half of second century A.D.) was an initiate of Osiris. Already, in Nero's reign, Osiris and Isis were not only welcomed at Roman shrines, but were deities of the whole world; cp. Lucan, *Phars.* viii. 831.

² Cp. *The Mysteries of Isis and Osiris*, liii. 1.

³ Cp. Foucart, *Les Mystères d'Éleusis*, pp. 71-7; cp. an "Invocation to Isis" (*Oxyrhynchus Texts*, vol. xi.), an original document showing the words of ritual used by an initiate of this faith. The document is second century.

⁴ "Ihre ausserordentlich häufige Verehrung seit der hellenistischen Zeit verdankt sie wohl vor allem ihrer Bedeutung als Meeresgöttin"; cp. Poland, *Geschichte des Griechischen Vereinswesens*, S. 220; cp. the marine pictures on the walls of the temple of Isis at Pompeii (Mau, *Pompeii, its Life and Art*, p. 174). The cult of Isis-Serapis is found at Athens at least as early as the third century B.C., at Pompeii about the end of the second century B.C., and at Rome in the time of Sulla. The Isis-cult, though suppressed four times, showed a marvellous tenacity and power of survival.

⁵ Cp. Scott-Moncrieff, *Paganism and Christianity in Egypt*, p. 15. For the importance of Horus in early Dynastic Egypt, cp. Moret et Davy, *Des Clans aux empires*, pp. 156 ff.

Serapis,¹ whose cult was intimately associated with that of Isis, became the most important deity at Alexandria, and his influence extended far beyond Egypt² at an early date.

In various ways the Egyptian Mysteries influenced those of the Hellenic world, although there was probably never a complete fusion of the two. In any case, Egypt was not the only source of the Greek Mysteries. The logical outcome of the Stoic view, that human reason is a spark of the Divine, was mysticism. In its later history, Stoicism shows this. Naturally the Greek mind was not mystical any more than the Jewish mind. Yet, at the same time, it is not improper to say that there was a native Greek mystical element. Nevertheless the core of the Greek Mysteries was non-Hellenic.³

The Greek religions were bound up with the city or State, and their object was to secure the well-being of the community. The Mysteries, on the other hand, while they might have a State connection, were in the first instance directly in touch with the individual as such.⁴ The Mysteries were not something that the conquering Hellenic tribes brought with them and imposed on the conquered races, but in part the heritage from the native races whom the Greeks found in the land.⁵ Just

¹ For the origin of the name Serapis, cp. Scott-Moncrieff, *Paganism and Christianity in Egypt*, pp. 19-20. The purpose which the Ptolemies had in view in introducing the worship of Serapis was political: to fuse together the Greek and Egyptian elements through a common religion; cp. Cumont, *Les Religions orientales dans le paganisme romain*, pp. 91-2.

² There was probably a temple of Serapis at Puteoli as early as 150 B.C.; cp. Dill, *Roman Society from Nero to Marcus Aurelius*, p. 563.

³ "Das älteste Telesterion vorhellenisch war"; cp. Persson, "Der Ursprung der eleusinischen Mysterien" (*Archiv für Religionswissenschaft*, Bd. xxi. Hefte 3-4, S. 292). "Le mysticisme grec tire très probablement son origine des religions préhelléniques, cultes agraires, orgiastiques, riches en rites de purification et d'aversion"; cp. Boulanger, *Orphée*, p. 43.

⁴ "Vor allem ist die Bezeichnung $\pi\rho\delta\ \acute{\rho}\acute{o\lambda\epsilon\omega\varsigma$ bei Mysten üblich, gewiss um einen Gegensatz zu städtischen Vereinen zu betonen," e.g. Ephesus, $\acute{o}\iota\ \pi\rho\delta\ \acute{\rho}\acute{o\lambda\epsilon\omega\varsigma\ \Delta\eta\mu\eta\tau\rho\iota\alpha\sigma\tau\alpha\iota\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \Delta\iota\omicron\nu\acute{o}\delta\sigma\omicron\upsilon\ \Phi\acute{\lambda}\acute{\epsilon}\omega\ \mu\acute{\upsilon}\sigma\tau\alpha\iota$; cp. Poland, *Geschichte des Griechischen Vereinswesens*, S. 86.

⁵ Miss Harrison finds, beneath the cult of the Olympian Zeus, an older, cruder cult of Meilichios, worshipped in the form of a snake. The ritual of this older cult was probably more magical than religious,

because the cults belonged to conquered peoples, they would naturally incline to be celebrated in secret. This perhaps explains why the Mysteries were usually performed at night.¹

Dionysus, along with Hecate, was the mystery deity *par excellence*.² In Asia Minor, his cult was often fused with that of Cybele, whose religion closely resembled that of Dionysus. Round the Cretan Dionysus, the entire Orphic teaching centred. According to Orphic doctrine, Zagreus, son of Zeus and Persephone, was torn in pieces by the Titans and devoured. His heart, however, was saved, and was carried to Zeus, who swallowed it. Thence it passed into the Theban Dionysus, son of Zeus and Semele. In this way Zagreus was reborn as Dionysus.³ The legend of the birth, death, and resurrec-

and aimed at getting rid of evil influences. The purificatory rites of this and similar cults she regards as the origin of the Mysteries; cp. *Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Religion*, pp. 12 ff.

¹ A different explanation is given by Clement of Alexandria: "Night has been called Euphronê, because at that time the soul has rest from the perceptions of sense, turns in upon itself, and has a greater share of wisdom. Hence the Mysteries are generally celebrated at night to indicate the withdrawal at night of the soul from the body"; cp. *Stromata*, iv. 22.

² Speaking of Dionysus, Poland says: "Keinen Gott sucht der antike Mensch so innerlich zu erfassen"; "Kein Gott beherrscht in dem Masse das griechische Vereinsleben wie er"; cp. *Geschichte des Griechischen Vereinswesens*, SS. 67, 196.

³ For the Titans as the authors of Dionysus' sufferings, cp. Pausanias, viii. 37. According to Frazer, Dionysus was originally a Thracian god, the god of the vine and of wine. He is probably to be identified with the Thracian and Phrygian deity Sabazius, and was "a god of beer or of other cereal intoxicants before he became a god of wine"; cp. *Golden Bough*, pt. v. vol. i. p. 2 n. 2. Reinach thinks that originally Zagreus was probably a serpent with horns at his birth; cp. *Cultes et religions*, p. 62. He points out that, just as in Orphism, so in the Celtic religions, we find the threefold idea of the sexual union of two serpents, a divine egg produced, and the birth of a horned serpent, a god; cp. *op. cit.* p. 64.

It has been suggested, but without probability, that "the princes of this world" (1 Cor. ii. 6) are to be identified with the Titans. In several respects, Zagreus is unlike Christ. Zagreus is not a voluntary victim. He does everything to escape his murderers. It is not conceivable that Zagreus should desire to give to men, the sinful offspring of the Titans, the benefit of his sufferings. It was alien to Greek thinking to suppose that the suffering of an innocent person could be an expiation for the guilt of sinners. Zagreus is unlike Christ, because the god devoured by the Titans appears as a different person. Zagreus ceases to be, and, in his place, appears Dionysus. In Orphism, it is

tion of Zagreus (Dionysus) forms the basis of Orphism. It is interesting to note that Orphic teaching has a doctrine of original sin and deliverance from the same. Men were said to have sprung from the ashes of the Titans, and so bear the guilt of their crime, from whose ill-effects they can be delivered only by initiation according to Orphic rites. Orphism was a reorganisation and reformation of the cult of Dionysus.

But while these two, Dionysus and Orpheus, came to be regarded as identical, there were fundamental differences between the two. Dionysus was a god: Orpheus¹ was a man. Dionysus was drunken: Orpheus was sober. In place of the drunkenness of the cult of

not participation in the sacrifice of Zagreus that gives redemption; but salvation is due to the ascetic life, and to participation in the ritual of purification. In the Orphic system, the connection between mankind and the Titans is purely physical.

¹ Reinach would derive the name Orpheus from a root *orp*, meaning "obscure"; cp. *Cultes et religions*, ii. p. 122. For explanations of "Orpheus," cp. Boulanger, *Orphée*, pp. 29-30. Eisler would explain "Orpheus" as meaning "the fisher," deriving it from the word "orphoi," the name of the sacred fish in the sanctuaries of Apollo in Lycia; cp. Eisler, *Orpheus*, p. 14. In the same way, Eisler would explain "Zagreus" as "za" and "agreus" ("za" being a magnifying prefix). He says that "Zagreus," so explained, "can mean just as well the 'Great Fisher' as the 'Great Hunter'"; cp. *Orpheus*, p. 15.

For the importance of Orpheus as the originator of Mysteries, cp. Hippolytus, *Refut.* v. p. 218. It is possible, however, that Hippolytus did not know enough about Orphism to give a judgment of value. For original sources in regard to the Orphic Mysteries, cp. Kern, *Orphicorum Fragmenta*, pp. 26 ff. (90-105).

For the Christian apologists, Orpheus was "le représentant du monothéisme parmi les païens, le prophète de la grande œuvre de salut accomplie par le Christ"; cp. Boulanger, *Orphée*, p. 120.

That Orphism must have had a certain influence on Christian thought is shown by the following: (1) there is a representation of Orpheus crucified on the cross like Christ (Gnostic gem, Museum, Berlin); cp. Eisler, *Orpheus*, plate xxxi.; cp. Kern, *Orphicorum Fragmenta*, p. 46. (2) In early Christian art, Christ is represented as Orpheus, the "good shepherd," with Phrygian head-dress and lyre, and seated among a group of wild and tame animals; cp. Eisler, *Orpheus*, pp. 51 ff.

"Mais il paraît y avoir entre le christianisme et l'orphisme une ressemblance d'esprit qu'on chercherait vainement ailleurs"; cp. Boulanger, *Orphée*, pp. 11-12. Boulanger, at the same time, rightly recognises that Orphic doctrine and ritual influenced primitive Christianity only in an indirect way; cp. *Orphée*, p. 164; cp. Eisler, *Orpheus*, p. 100, where Eisler would find Orphic influence in the story of the penny in the fish's mouth, Matt. xvii. 24-7.

Dionysus, Orphism would put spiritual ecstasy.¹ To the end Dionysus bears the marks of his matriarchal origin.²

It is probable that Orphism, as a Mystery religion, had its origin in pre-Hellenic cults.³ Herodotus⁴ affirms that the Orphics modelled their system after the Egyptian example. It existed as early as the sixth century B.C.⁵ Characteristic of Orphism was this, that it set forth a definitely established system of thinking, in this respect differing not only from the State religions, but also from the doctrine of other religious societies. It recognised in man a child of "the starry heaven" as well as of earth;⁶ the strenuous personal effort of the individual soul in seeking deliverance from "the sorrowful

¹ Dionysus was the god of unmixed wine; cp. Eisler, *Orpheus*, p. 273 n. 3. Cp. Harrison, *Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Religion*, pp. 456-77; cp. Cumont, *Astrology and Religion among the Greeks and Romans*, p. 173.

² Cp. Harrison, *Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Religion*, p. 562.

³ Boulanger would find several sources of Orphism: a Thracophrygian element, perhaps an Indian through Iran (transmigration), an Egyptian (representations of the other world), the influence of the Thiasoi of Southern Italy, and agrarian and chthonian cults which were purely Hellenic; cp. *Orphée*, pp. 43 ff. Orphism stands out in several respects in vivid contrast with the Homeric religion. In the latter there were several anthropomorphic deities; in Orphism, deity is more exalted, larger, more removed from the devotee, even though the Orphic might aspire to become eventually identified with deity. The Orphic religion was also mystical, recognised original sin, and retribution or reward according to one's deeds. The whole outlook on life is different in the two religions. In the Homeric religion, it is joyous. In the Orphic religion, it is gloomy, and all real hope is centred on the beyond. In the Homeric religion, the soul is simply that which animates the body, and exists in a shadowy form in Hades after death. In Orphism, the soul is all-important and eternal.

Cp. Persson, "Der Ursprung der eleusinischen Mysterien" (*Archiv für Religionswissenschaft*, Bd. xxi. Hefte 3-4), S. 309. "The most probable account of the matter is that the religious teaching attributed to Orpheus was of Asiatic and particularly of Phrygian provenance"; cp. Legge, *Forerunners and Rivals of Christianity*, i. p. 122. The Greeks identified Dionysus-Zagreus with Sabazius, who seems originally to have come from Phrygia.

⁴ Cp. *Herodotus*, ii. 81. For Orpheus as a founder of Mysteries, cp. Aristophanes, *Frogs*, 1032.

⁵ "Nicht vor den letzten Jahrzehnten des sechsten Jahrhunderts begründet sein konnten"; cp. Rohde, *Psyche*, ii. SS. 103, 105 n. 2; cp. Boulanger, *Orphée*, p. 35.

⁶ Cp. the Petelia tablet, the Campagno tablet (b): "For I also, I avow me, am of your blessed race"; cp. Gilbert Murray's translation, Harrison, *Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Religion*, pp. 661, 670.

weary wheel" of recurring mortal existence;¹ the inevitable necessity of paying the penalty for sin;² emphasis on purity;³ the doctrine of rebirth;⁴ and the belief in a secure and blessed hereafter for the initiated.⁵

Though the ultimate sources of Orphism are non-Hellenic, it exercised a dominant influence on the development of Greek religious life. Its gods have been described as "the only real gods" in ancient Greek religion.⁶ In the able hands of the Pythagorean philosophers, it received a fully articulated and consistent shape. It laid hold of and transformed the Eleusinian and other Mysteries.

In later times, Orphic societies sprang up over a wide area, and by their teaching that man was of divine origin; by their mystical and sacramental rites of initiation, whereby men were not only reborn and made pure, but were assured of ultimate union with deity; by their strong antithesis of spirit and flesh and the high ecstasy of their spiritual life; by their direct appeal to the individual soul and their devotion to the ideal of brotherhood; by their other-worldliness and their certainty of eternal bliss for all who through initiation have attained to the purity of the reborn,—they did a service which can

¹ Cp. Compagno tablet (a): "I have flown out of the sorrowful weary wheel," where "the sorrowful weary wheel" means the constantly recurring cycle of life upon life by which the individual went through a series of incarnations.

² Cp. Compagno tablet (b): "I have paid the penalty for deeds unrighteous."

³ The purity was secured through the rites of the Orphic ritual. The ethical element in it was presumably not strongly marked; cp. Compagno tablet (b): "Out of the pure I come"; cp. Cæcilia Secundina tablet: "She comes from the pure."

⁴ Cp. Timpone grande tablet (a): "Thou art become God from man. A kid thou art fallen into milk"; cp. Compagno tablet (a): It was the belief of the initiated that, through initiation, he was new born as a young divine animal, as a kid, *i.e.* as one of the god's many incarnations; cp. Boulanger, *Orphée*, p. 108 n. Eisler would connect the phrase with the passage through the Milky Way; cp. Eisler, *Orpheus*, p. 7 n. 2.

⁵ Cp. Compagno tablet (a): "I have passed with eager feet to the Circle desired."

⁶ Cp. Harrison, *Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Religion*, p. 658.

never be reckoned as a preparation for the coming of the Christian faith and life.

Having already had occasion to note the influence of Orphism¹ on the Mysteries of Eleusis, we now turn to consider these Mysteries themselves. In view of the important part played by Herakles in the religious life of St. Paul's native city, it is specially interesting to remember that Xenophon affirms that Herakles was admitted to the holy Mysteries of Eleusis by peculiar privilege.² The term Eleusis has been explained as "Anabasis," or "the way up."³ The origin of the Eleusinian Mysteries has been sought in the imported cults of Egypt,⁴ and in the crude faiths of the native populations,⁵ whom the invading Greeks had overcome.

¹ Foucart denies the formative influence of Orphism on the development of the Eleusinian Mysteries; cp. *Les Mystères d'Éleusis*, pp. 253-4; cp. Rohde, *Psyche*, i. S. 285.

² Cp. *Hellenica*, vi. iii. 6.

³ Cp. Mead, *Thrice-Greatest Hermes*, ii. p. 171, and C.H.I. 24; cp. the use of "the way" in the New Testament.

⁴ The influence of the Egyptians on Asia must go back to a very early date. Foucart points out that even a Pharaoh of the Fifth Dynasty (3950-3700 B.C.) had a fleet of war in the Mediterranean; cp. *Les Mystères d'Éleusis*, Appendix, pp. 499-500 (the prisoners brought home by the fleet are clearly Asiatics). The main points of Foucart's view are: (1) the cult of Isis-Osiris was introduced from Egypt in the sixteenth or fifteenth century B.C.; (2) these deities were at first known as "the god and goddess"; (3) before the eleventh century B.C. they were definitely named Demeter and Dionysus; (4) in the early period, the religion of Demeter was agricultural, and the rites were expressive of the fertility of the soil and of the human race; (5) in the seventh or sixth century B.C. the Mysteries were definitely established, embodying certain new beliefs, and equipped with an organised priesthood; cp. *Les Mystères d'Éleusis*, pp. 248 ff.; cp. also pp. 19 ff., 23, 41, 46 (the Egyptian colonists introduced, along with the cult of Isis-Osiris, the cultivation of the vine and cereals in the neighbourhood of Eleusis).

⁵ Persson suggests that Eleusis, from its position, would be a natural retreat for the native population fleeing before the conquering Indo-Germanic host. He explains the comparative mildness and gentleness of the deities Demeter and Dionysus as due to their being divinities of the subdued races, and the important part played by women in the cult as originating from the fact that, in their earliest form, the Mysteries had to do with the fruitfulness of the soil; cp. "Der Ursprung der eleusinischen Mysterien" (*Archiv für Religionswissenschaft*, Bd. xxi. Hefte 3-4), SS. 289, 293, 298-306.

While pointing out that the Cretan religion was not secret originally, Persson maintains that the Eleusinian Mysteries were greatly influenced by the religion of Crete, and gives the following reasons for his view: (1) "das älteste Telesterion ist vorhellenisch"; (2) "der Name Eleusis

It is still an open question which of these two is the main source. It is possible also that an important contribution was made from both, that, in fact, the religion of Eleusis was an early example of what we find so abundant at a later stage—a syncretism.

Remarkable is this fact that women played an outstanding part in the rites. It is even possible that these rites of Eleusis were at first confined to women.¹ As one thinks of this, the thought of the new status given to the womenfolk by Christianity instinctively arises in our minds, and we ask the question, so hard to answer, how much of that new attitude was due to Eleusinian influence?

It is important to note that, in the earlier period, the Eleusinia and the Mysteries are not to be regarded as identical terms.² Still, inasmuch as we have to do here with a cult which dealt with the growth and decay of vegetation and the annual fruits of the soil,³ there must

deutet auf das vorhellenische Kreta hin"; (3) "gewisse Kultgefäße, *κέρποι* und Giessopferkannen, sind für eleusinischen und minoischen Kult gemeinsam"; (4) "die Form des Telesterions ist vielleicht eine Entwicklung des minoischen sogenannten Theaters"; (5) "das Anaktoren ist identisch mit den kretischen Repositorien und sogenannten Hauskapellen"; (6) "die Reinigungen des eleusinischen Kultes stammen aus Kreta, wo sie ursprünglich der minoischen Religion angehören"; (7) "der Kern der Mysterien ist ein Fruchtbarkeitskult so wie der Kern der minoischen Religion"; (8) "eine doppelte antike Tradition leitet die Mysterien von Kreta ab. Diodor steht selbständig neben dem Demeterhymnus, von welchem Isokrates, Paneg. 28 f. abhängig ist, so wie Dionysos Halic. i. 61 und die Serviußscholien, S. 10; cp. "Der Ursprung der eleusinischen Mysterien," SS. 308-9. Miss Harrison holds that Dionysus was a god of Thracian origin, the god of the Bessi, an independent brigand tribe, and that Semele, the mother of Dionysus, is to be recognised in the Phrygian *ἑμελά*, i.e. the equivalent of the Greek *γῆ*, "earth"; cp. *Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Religion*, pp. 365 ff., 405.

¹ Cp. Harrison, *Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Religion*, p. 151 n. 1. Only married women could take part in the rites of initiation of Demeter; cp. Foucart, *Les Mystères d'Éleusis*, p. 67.

² "Mais dans tous les textes littéraires ou épigraphiques de l'époque attique, le terme *Ἐλευσινία* n'est jamais employé pour désigner les Mystères"; cp. Foucart, *Les Mystères d'Éleusis*, p. 49. "Les Éleusinia étaient distincts des Mystères; on les célébrait avant le 12 Boédromion, très probablement dans le mois Métagitnion"; cp. *op. cit.* p. 50.

³ "The great Eleusinian Mysteries were primarily the rite of man's maturity side by side with rites to promote the maturity of earth's fruits"; cp. Harrison, *Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Religion*, p. 16; cp. "the holy grain of Demeter," Hesiod, *Works and Days* (Mair's translation, pp. 17, 22).

always have been a tendency for that cult to point men on through death to the Beyond. There is a death and resurrection of Nature. There is the reproductive seed of the reaped grain, which again, at the call of spring, bursts into new life. There is the progressive history of the growing corn, which has its parallel in the story of the life of each man. The process of birth, growth, death, and resurrected life in Nature was a cycle of mystery to the primitive mind, in a way that we moderns, with our scientific training, find difficult to realise. If there was resurrection for the modest grain, surely, men reasoned, there must be resurrection, continued life, for man with his lofty spiritual endowments. The very anxiety to make certain of better life in the Beyond created the demand for some guarantee to secure this. Hence the origin of the rites of initiation.

The Mysteries were dramatic in form, a kind of religious pantomime accompanied by statutory speeches and sacred songs. They included the "Little"¹ and the "Great" Mysteries. The former were an indispensable step towards participation in the latter. The "Great" Mysteries lasted for several days,² and their most salient characteristic was the conveyance in solemn procession of the sacred objects³ to Athens, and from Athens back to Eleusis.

The chief deities of the Eleusinian cult are Demeter⁴

¹ τὰ μικρὰ μυστήρια took place in the Spring (probably from 19th to 21st Anthesterion), not at Eleusis, but at Agra. They were the first step in initiation, and included instruction and a ritual of purification. The "Little" Mysteries were an imitation of the story of Dionysus.

² For the dates, cp. Foucart, *Les Mystères d'Eleusis*, p. 302.

³ The *lepá* were conveyed to Athens in a heavy rustic carriage with four plain wheels, and drawn by oxen. The whole equipment was meant to be in keeping with the simple character of Demeter as the goddess of agriculture.

⁴ In the Homeric Hymn to Demeter (c. 600 B.C.), Demeter is represented as refusing to drink the red wine offered her, and asking for a draught of "meal and water, and soft leaves of pennyroyal." She caused the soil to be barren until her daughter Persephone was restored to her.

Gilbert Murray points out the remarkable fact that, in the Eleusinian Mysteries, Demeter (and along with her Persephone, who is so intimately connected with Demeter) is dangerously associated with a

and Dionysus. Demeter was essentially an agricultural deity, the goddess of fertility, reproduction, and growth. Dionysus was not only the god of intoxication,¹ through which the state of divine ecstasy was produced, but also the tree-god, the god of the fig tree, the god of all beautiful blossoming things, the god who gave men the drama to brighten and idealise their wearisome lot on earth. It is more than probable that the cult of both deities was grafted on to an older chthonian worship.²

The distinctive mystery name of Dionysus at Eleusis was Iacchos.³ In the solemn procession, his image, mounted on a chariot, and accompanied by a priest,⁴ led the way. After his image, there came the heavy rustic chariot bearing the *iépa*, then the hierophant and the dadouchos (torch-bearer), then the sacred families,⁵ the Eumolpides and Keryces, then the initiates, and finally an immense crowd of interested people. Iacchos' rôle concluded with the arrival at Eleusis, "the reception

sacred sow; cp. *The Four Stages of Greek Religion*, p. 30; cp. Frazer, *Golden Bough*, Spirits of the Corn and of the Wild, ii. p. 25. (The pig was annually sacrificed to the moon and Osiris.)

¹ It has to be noted that the Greeks, like other Southern peoples, were not addicted to excessive drunkenness. Their wine-cups were small, and they mixed their wine with water.

² Miss Harrison maintains that the Pithoigia was originally the opening of the grave-jars, not the wine-jars, and that the Anthesteria, though superficially a wine-festival in honour of Dionysus, has a note of sadness running through it which points back to its being originally a festival of the shades; cp. *Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Religion*, pp. 36, 43, 76.

³ Iacchos was "Dionysus at the breast," i.e. the child Dionysus (so Suidas).

⁴ *ιακκαγωγός*.

⁵ Persson thinks that originally the Eleusinian cult was a family cult; cp. "Der Ursprung der eleusinischen Mysterien" (*Archiv für Religionswissenschaft*, Bd. xxi. Hefte 3-4), S. 303. The hierophant was the chief of the Eumolpides, and his main function was the celebration of the Mysteries. The dadouchos belonged to the family of the Keryces. Along with the hierophant, he was at the head of the priesthood of Eleusis. His precise function in the rites of initiation is not known; cp. Foucart, *Les Mystères d'Éleusis*, pp. 168 ff., 196; cp. Rohde, *Psyche*, i. S. 282 n. 3. The sacred marriage of the hierophant and priestess was symbolic of the heavenly marriage of Zeus and Demeter. It was an assurance of abundance and prosperity for Attica. Among the Babylonians, the right of exorcising evil spirits, securing an oracle, and performing sacrifice was reserved for special families; cp. Jastrow, *Religion of Babylonia and Assyria*, p. 659.

of Iacchos" being the final ceremony in which the procession ended.

It is characteristic of the Eleusinian Mysteries that they tended more and more towards what one might call a catholic spirit. Both men and women were freely admitted to participate in their sacred rites. At first only Athenians were eligible, but, later on, any one of Hellenic stock might become an initiate. Even slaves were not debarred. Primarily, the Eleusinian Mysteries addressed themselves to the individual as such, not to the community as a whole ; but, in course of time, the Eleusinian cult became a State religion.¹ Their devotees were marked by a striking enthusiasm.²

With such characteristics, one can hardly fail to see that the Eleusinian Mysteries contributed a large part to the spiritual environment in which Paulinism arose, and by which Paulinism was profoundly influenced in its most formative period. At the same time there were fundamental differences between the religion of St. Paul and the religion of Eleusis, and there can be no doubt that, if the Eleusinian Mysteries influenced primitive Christianity, they were at the same time one of the real rivals of Christianity in the religious life of the first century A.D.³

When we turn to another Mystery religion, namely Mithraism, we are at once impressed by the striking resemblances between it and primitive Christianity.⁴ This applies alike to belief and practice. They have, in common, belief in a revelation divinely inspired and given, upon which their doctrine is based, belief in personal immortality, future retribution, a last judgment, the resurrection of the dead, the final destruction of the

¹ Cp. Reinach, *Orpheus*, p. 140 ; Rohde, *Psyche*, i. S. 281.

² "L'enthousiasme religieux est ce qui caractérise les mystères d'Éleusis et les distingue de tous les autres cultes helléniques" ; cp. Foucart, *Les Mystères d'Éleusis*, p. 386.

³ Cp. Hatch, *The Pauline Idea of Faith* (Harvard Theological Studies), p. 71.

⁴ Reinach would explain these similarities, at least in part, by a "milieu mystique," out of which both originated ; cp. *Cultes et religions*, ii. p. 228.

material universe in fire, a heaven above prepared for the blessed, and a hell beneath the earth, and peopled with demons, for the damned. Both kept Sunday.¹ Both formed small communities, the members of which called each other "brother." Both had a baptismal rite with purificatory associations, a kind of confirmation by which the power to overcome evil spirits was obtained, and a communion service which gave assurance of salvation for soul and body. In both we find a lofty standard of personal morality, and the demand for abstinence and continence, self-mastery and self-renunciation. In both, and this is specially a mark of St. Paul's teaching, religion and morality are inseparable.

Now while it cannot be proved that St. Paul was directly in touch with any of the Mithraic communities, there is reason to believe that the Mithras cult had gained a hold of Cilicia several generations before St. Paul's day.² There is even the probability, in view of the appearance of Mithra on the thirteenth-century inscription at Boghaz Keui, that Mithraism had penetrated into Cilicia about that time.³ Böhlig finds good reason for identifying, in the case of Tarsus, the Anatolian Mithra with the god Sandan.⁴ We may be fairly certain, in any case, that the spirit of Mithraism was in

¹ At a very early date, there was the celebration of the 25th December in Mithraism, and, in the case of the Church, it was observed at least from the fourth century. It has been suggested that in this matter the Church borrowed from Mithraism, though absolute proof is wanting. Cp. Frazer, *Adonis, Attis, Osiris*, p. 254 (Frazer holds the view that the festival of Christmas was directly borrowed from the religion of Mithras); cp. *The Worship of Nature*, i. pp. 526-7.

² "Weil der Mithra-Kult in dem Lande, in das uns unsre Arbeit versetzt, nachweislich schon ca. 100 Jahre vor Paulus vorhanden war"; cp. Böhlig, *Die Geisteskultur von Tarsos*, S. 89.

³ "Im ursprünglichen-Kilikien, das auch Kappadokien umfasste, taucht Mithra bereits auf den Keilschrifttafeln des 13. Jahrhunderts zu Boghazkioi auf"; cp. Böhlig, *Die Geisteskultur von Tarsos*, S. 90; cp. Eisler, *Weltenmantel u. Himmelszelt*, S. 509.

⁴ Cp. *Die Geisteskultur von Tarsos*, S. 91. Verethraghna was the Mazdean Herakles who fought with and conquered the giants; cp. Cumont, *Les Mystères de Mithra*, p. 128 n. 2; cp. medal of Tarsus, showing Mithras slaying the bull (reproduction in Cumont, *Les Mystères de Mithra*, p. 28). It was Mithras who played the most heroic rôle.

the religious atmosphere of St. Paul's native city in the formative days of his boyhood.

Mithraism showed an accommodating spirit as regards other cults. One of the consequences of the conquests of Alexander the Great was the introduction of Greek civilisation into Asia Minor, and a certain amount of fusion of Iranism and the religion of Greece, manifesting itself in a process of identification of their respective deities. There was a close connection between the cult of Mithras and that of the Magna Mater. The priests of the Magna Mater were officially recognised, and exercised great influence. For political reasons it was advantageous for Mithraism to form an alliance with this cult, and there was the further advantage that the religion of the Magna Mater admitted women as initiates.¹

In the earliest sources of our knowledge of Iranian beliefs, Mithras is the "genius of heavenly light."² He was not the supreme god of Mithraism.³ Yet he has marvellous powers, hears all, sees all, knows all, so that no one can ever deceive him. Mithras is described as "the god out of a rock."⁴ The rock is in the form of an

¹ The devotees of Mithras constructed their crypts under the shelter of the temples of the Magna Mater. It has to be noted, however, that Mithraism, with few exceptions, obtained no real hold upon the religious life of Greece proper. The Greeks were disinclined to recognise the religion of their hereditary enemies. Besides, the Greeks had their own Mysteries, specially those of Eleusis, which satisfied all their religious needs; cp. Cumont, *Les Religions orientales dans le paganisme romain*, p. 261 n. 21.

² Cp. the Yashts (twenty-one songs of praise). Our knowledge of Mithraism is mainly derived from inscriptions and sculptures in the temples of Mithras, and from scattered references in the Fathers and other writers. Cumont derives Mithraism from Magism. On a tablet of a third-century temple of Mithras discovered in Rome, he is described as "Sun-god, The Great, God of the Spirits, Saviour, Giver of Riches, Benefactor," etc.

³ The supreme god of Mithraism was Zervan akarana, i.e., "infinite time." He is sometimes called *Alōn* or *Sæculum*, sometimes *Κρόνος* or *Saturnus*. Sometimes he is identified with Fate (*Εἰμαρμένη*). He is the producer alike of Ormuzd and Ahriman. He rules and guides the four elements. He is represented as having a human body with a lion's head, and round him a serpent winds itself. He is without sex or passion. Cp. Cumont, *Les Mystères de Mithra*, pp. 107 ff., 116 ff., 126.

⁴ *θεὸς ἐκ πέτρας*. It has been suggested that this explains "the rock was Christ" (1 Cor. x. 4). It is certainly remarkable that Mithras is

egg, and may possibly depict the cosmic egg. His miraculous birth is sometimes watched by shepherds.¹ In one of the scenes, Mithras is represented as standing before a tree. He is naked except for the distinctive cap. From the tree, he tears a branch bearing leaves and fruit. Immediately afterwards, he is depicted as coming out of the foliage fully clothed in Oriental garb.² In a succession of scenes, he chases, captures, and rides Goshurun, the heavenly bull. Then he throws it over his shoulder, and carries it into his cave or chapel. Finally, Mithras sacrifices the bull, and, along with the sun-god, and, in the presence of initiates, and, beside the dead bull, shares in a ritual feast.³ Mithras is eventually borne aloft in the chariot of the sun-god.⁴ Ascended to the abode of the gods, Mithras continues to be the protector of those who serve him faithfully. He is at once the Demiurge, the Mediator, and the Saviour of men.⁵ In the mystic agapes celebrated by the initiates of Mithras, there was the periodic commemoration of the heroic services rendered by him to mankind.

The most salient feature of Mithraism as a system

depicted as shooting arrows from a bow at a rock, with the result that water gushes out of it. But to find a connection between the god out of a rock and St. Paul's description of Christ is probably, as Cumont thinks, a "forced parallelism" and a "caricature"; cp. *Les Mystères de Mithra*, pp. 132 n. 2 (for sources), 205; cp. Eisler, *Weltenmantel u. Himmelszelt*, SS. 411, 524 n. 4.

¹ Cp. The shepherds and the birth of Christ.

² Cp. The fall of man.

³ A parallelism between this and the Lord's Supper has been suggested, but there is no conclusive proof that the latter was influenced by the former. For Mithras wearing the star-spangled mantle and slaying the bull, cp. Eisler, *Weltenmantel u. Himmelszelt*, S. 62.

⁴ Cp. our Lord's Ascension.

⁵ Cp. The Pauline conception of Christ. In Mithraism, the priest was also a mediator between God and men. It has to be noted that, alike in a physical and in a moral sense, Mithras was "mediator." He was the god of light, dwelling in the air, which is the medium of light (so we must understand his dwelling-place in the space between heaven and the lower regions). He was also, in a moral and religious sense, the mediator between the unapproachable highest god and men. He is the god who will raise the dead, act as their judge, destroy the godless in fire, and give blessedness to the pious. In the Mithraic religion, the souls of the righteous were believed to ascend to heaven by means of a ladder. Cp. Cumont, *Études syriennes*, p. 91 n.; cp. Huart, *La Perse antique*, p. 99 f.

was its vivid personification of the opposing principles of good and evil. It was probably this stark dualism¹ which made its doctrine so attractive to many minds of the Occident.

The entire worship of Mithras was conducted in Mysteries or secret ceremonies.² It is noteworthy that, as in the case of St. Paul, the mysticism of Mithraism was not merely contemplative, but fiercely practical. Sincere religious belief and a virile morality were in both cases inseparably bound up together. Although it was introduced comparatively late among the Romans, it was a faith which, by its strongly ethical character, particularly appealed to a robust race.

According to Plutarch, it would appear to have been introduced into Italy soon after 67 B.C.³ Once introduced among the Romans, it spread with amazing rapidity. This was largely due to its special fascination for the soldiers of the legions. While, in the time of Augustus, Mithraism was still almost entirely outside the Empire,⁴ about the end of the first century of the Christian era, it had not only penetrated Rome and Central Italy, but had probably found a home in all the Latin provinces. It became an international religion. The cult of Mithras extended from Lambessa to Hadrian's Wall.⁵

¹ Dualism was already a characteristic of Greek philosophical thinking. But what specially marked the dualism of Mithraism was its deification of the principle of evil. In Mithraism, Ahriman is a monarch in his own right. He has a great army of subject demons, who dwell in his domain of darkness. Emerging from the lower regions, and attempting to overthrow the successor of Kronos, they are hurled down again. Nevertheless they have the power to wander to and fro on the face of the earth, spread corruption and plague, stir up evil passions in men, and do all sorts of mischief.

² "In the twenty Mithraic sanctuaries found and explored in Rome recently, the entrance has in each case been carefully concealed"; cp. Cobern, *The New Archaeological Discoveries and their Bearing upon the New Testament*, p. 506.

³ Cp. *Vita Pompeii*, xxiv. Plutarch would seem to say that the cult of Mithras was first introduced among the Romans by the Cilician pirates who were crushed by Pompey. The truth which probably lies behind this is that Mithraism was introduced to the Romans *via* Asia Minor; cp. Huart, *La Perse antique*, p. 139.

⁴ Cp. Cumont, *Les Mystères de Mithra*, p. 34.

⁵ Cp. Dill, *Roman Society from Nero to Marcus Aurelius*, pp. 386 ff.

It was fortunate, in one respect, in its comparatively late spread to the Occident. For, on that account, it escaped the persecution which befel cults that were brought in at an earlier date.

Mithraism was a cult which, for personal and political reasons, would specially commend itself to the deified Roman emperors. The "Fortuna Augusti" which appears on coins from the time of Vespasian was influenced by the Mithraistic idea of the "Hvarenô," the special endowment of divinity conferred on kings.¹

As it readily commended itself for this reason to the Roman Cæsars, it equally commended itself to the mass of the people by its ready adoption of the varying religious atmosphere. It suffered, indeed, from a hyper-syncretistic tendency. In this respect it compared unfavourably with Christianity. Nevertheless, Mithraism is, after Christianity, at once the purest, and manliest, of faiths. There is reason to believe that it was already an important element in the religious atmosphere which St. Paul breathed in the days of his childhood.

What conclusion are we to draw in view of all the evidence? Seeing that there are strong reasons for believing that Mithraism was prevalent in St. Paul's own homeland, not only in his day, but long before, seeing that there are many and most impressive similarities between Mithraism and St. Paul's teaching, are we not led to conclude that St. Paul was in measure influenced by Mithraic teaching, especially in the formative days of his youth, that he carried this influence with him into his after life, became an ardent disciple of Jesus Christ, and presented and developed His gospel in keeping with his own distinctive genius and experience? While we may give our assent to this view, we do not forget that St. Paul's gospel is essentially the gospel of Jesus Christ, the great new message delivered to mankind

¹ Cp. Cumont, *Les Mystères de Mithra*, pp. 94 ff. Aurelian proclaimed latinised Mithraism (the cult of Sol Invictus) the State religion. For Nero's favour for Mithraism, cp. Pliny, *H.N.* xxx. 6; Dion Cass. lxii. 5.

from God, and that there was much in Mithraism which, alike in spirit and in substance, was alien to that gospel.

We now turn finally to the Hermetic religion, and give our first consideration to the date of the Hermetic Corpus. It is practically certain that the major part of this body of writings belongs to the second century A.D.¹ But these writings, particularly Poimandres, have been worked over.² In their earlier form, some of them at least go back to the first century A.D.³ They represent, indeed, a religious tradition reaching back a long way—perhaps as early as the Ptolemaic times.⁴ An earlier form of Poimandres is implied by the *Shepherd of Hermas*,⁵ and we may be certain that this more primitive writing was in no way influenced by Christian doctrine or practice.⁶ The older view that Poimandres originated out of Neoplatonism is now generally rejected.⁷ Reitzenstein finds in Poimandres a two-fold element—one Egyptian, the other non-Egyptian.⁸

¹ Cp. Reitzenstein, *Poimandres*, S. 208. Scott thinks that probably none of the *Hermetica*, as they have come down to us, are "so early as the first century"; cp. Scott, *Hermetica*, p. 10.

² Cp. Reitzenstein, *Poimandres*, SS. 36, 59. The earliest part of Poimandres was probably the cosmological; cp. ὁ τῆς αἰθερίας νοῦς, where the αἰθερία "ist das Himmelsreich"; cp. *Poimandres*, S. 8 n.

³ Cp. Bousset, *Kyrios Christos*, S. 139 n. 1. "Ich halte das System des Poimandres für frühgnostisch, vorvalentianisch, also dem ersten christlichen Jahrhundert angehörig"; cp. *op. cit.*, S. 168 n. 2; cp. Reitzenstein, *Die Hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen*, S. 33; cp. Mead, *Thrice-Greatest Hermes*, iii. p. 323.

⁴ Cp. Kirksopp Lake, *The Stewardship of Faith*, p. 98 n. Mead regards Mind unto Hermes as contemporary with Philo; cp. *Thrice-Greatest Hermes*, ii. p. 193; cp. Mead, *op. cit.*, ii. 192, iii. 322.

⁵ Cp. Reitzenstein, *Poimandres*, SS. 13, 32: "Müssen wir folgern, dass im Hirten des Hermas eine ältere und ausführlichere Fassung des Poimandres benutzt ist." Cp. Mead, *Thrice-Greatest Hermes*, i. p. 378.

⁶ Cp. Reitzenstein, *Poimandres*, SS. 36, 67. For references in early Christian writings to the Trismegistic literature, cp. Reitzenstein, *Poimandres*, S. 2; cp. Mead, *Thrice-Greatest Hermes*, i. p. 43, iii. p. 323.

⁷ Cp. Reitzenstein, *Poimandres*, SS. 59, 195. Norden presents evidence of the influence of Posidonius in the Hermetic writings; cp. *Agnostos Theos*, S. 277 n. 2.

⁸ Meyer thinks that Reitzenstein exaggerates as regards the influence of the Egyptian texts, and finds that in regard to its conception of creation, Poimandres borrows directly from Genesis; cp. *Ursprung und Anfänge des Christentums*, ii. SS. 372 ff. The non-Egyptian part is regarded by Reitzenstein as "das älteste gnostische System, das wir kennen"; cp. *Poimandres*, S. 114.

Cp. *Poimandres*, SS. 67 ff.: "Nicht-ägyptisch ist vor allem, was

Hermes himself is a syncretistic deity. There are probably Pelasgian, Greek, and Egyptian elements in his character.¹ In his most primitive form, he was probably a chthonian- or earth-divinity, and figured as the lord of herds, or the good shepherd.² He is intimately associated, and even identified, with Thoth,³ who

von dem ersten, dem himmlischen Menschen berichtet wird." Mead thinks that the name Poimandres is probably "a close transliteration of a Coptic phrase." In the dialect of Upper Egypt, "pemenetre" means "the witness." Mead thinks that Hermes is not the witness, but the herald of the witness; cp. *Thrice-Greatest Hermes*, ii. p. 51.

¹ Originally, outside Homer, Hermes was simply an old upright stone, a pillar furnished with the regular Pelasgian sex-symbol of procreation"; cp. Murray, *Four Stages of Greek Religion*, p. 74.

² Cp. Farnell, *The Cults of the Greek States*, v. pp. 10, 11. According to Reitzenstein, the cult of the Good Shepherd was originally associated with Anubis. The Phrygian religion also knew God as the shepherd; cp. *Die Hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen*, SS. 36, 107.

The conception of the "shepherd," or "good shepherd," reaches far back in the Babylonian religion. In a hymn to Tammuz, we read:

"The shepherd, lord Tammuz, abides no more,
The lord, shepherd of the folds, abides no more";

cp. Rogers, *Cuneiform Parallels to the Old Testament*, p. 183. In the Babylonian religion, the planets were regarded as "sheep," or "wandering sheep" (Jensen), and the sun as the overseer, or shepherd; cp. Jastrow, *Religion of Babylonia and Assyria*, p. 460.

On many tablets found by Haynes at Nippur, we find: "Ur-Ninib, the glorious shepherd of Nippur, the shepherd of Ur, he who delivers the commands of Eridu"; cp. Hilprecht, *Explorations in Bible Lands*, p. 378.

On an inscription from Nippur, we find: "Samsu-iluna, the shepherd who gladdens the heart of Marduk"; cp. Hilprecht, *Explorations in Bible Lands*, p. 481.

On bricks found at Nippur, Ashurbanipal is called "his [*i.e.* Bēl's] favourite shepherd"; cp. Hilprecht, *Explorations in Bible Lands*, p. 371.

According to Eisler, Orpheus, who was originally the "hunter" or "fisher," becomes Orpheus the "good shepherd," *i.e.* the "good shepherd" of the animals which in course of time had become tame; cp. *Orpheus, the Fisher*, p. 18.

³ Oannes, the Chaldean god, was, according to Berosus (*Frag ix.*), the Thot of Egypt. "Thot, chez les Egyptiens, est le dieu des sciences; c'est lui qui avait enseigné aux ancêtres l'arithmétique, la géométrie, l'arpentage, le dessin, le musique; c'est lui qui donna les principes de l'écriture, fort probablement sous la forme figurative qui a précédé l'hiéroglyphe"; cp. De Morgan, "L'Influence asiatique à l'origine de la civilisation égyptienne," p. 51 (*L'Anthropologie*, 1922).

In Egyptian texts, Thoth is frequently called "great-great," and probably also "very great-great"; cp. Scott, *Hermetica*, p. 5 n.

According to Manetho, Thoth was "the first Hermes." The earliest identification is made by Hecataeus; cp. Diod. i. 15-16. "The books in circulation bearing the name of Hermes . . . were translated from the Egyptian by men well skilled in Philosophy"; cp. Iamblichus, *On the Mysteries*, viii. 4. Reitzenstein points out that "in dem

was the "Thrice-great," *i.e.* the "Trismegistus"¹ of the Greeks. Along with Isis, Hermes is the greatest of the gods of revelation in the Hellenic mystery literature.²

Hermes is intimately associated with Zeus, whose messenger he was.³ In view of the fact that Herakles played such an important part in the religious life of Tarsus, it is interesting to note that Hermes was intimately associated with that deity and held the place of honour alongside of him.⁴ Hermes, quite independently of Jewish or Christian influence, was regarded as the Demiurge, the creator of things that are, and things that are to be. He was the interpreter of the gods to men. He was the generator of new lives, the god who brought back souls to be born again,⁵ in keeping with his rôle as leader of the departing soul.

He was, at the same time, a very active god in regard to the affairs of this present life. He was the patron-god of athletics, the god of the palaestra and gymnastic exercises,⁶ and the god of ways.⁷ He was peculiarly the

Naassener-Text, Osiris mit Hermes und zugleich mit dem phrygischen Papas identifiziert wird"; cp. *Poimandres*, S. 178.

¹ The earliest use of the title "Thrice-Greatest Hermes" in extant Greek appears in the letter of Manetho to Ptolemy Philadelphus (prior to 250 B.C.). Hermes is called the "Great-and-Great" on the Rosetta stone; cp. Budge, *The Decrees of Memphis and Canopus*, pp. 52, 108, 174. "Thoth, the eight-times-great" (found on the verso of two Greek documents, the contents of which prove them to be official land-registers of the seventh year of Claudius (A.D. 46-7)), has been shown by Mead to be equivalent to "Trismegistus"; cp. *Thrice-Greatest Hermes*, p. 119.

² "Hermes omnia solus et ter unus"; "Isis una quæ es omnia"; cp. Reitzenstein, *Die Hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen*, S. 14.

³ Cp. inscription found by Ramsay at Lystra in 1909, and made by native Lycaonians, recording the dedication of a statue to Zeus and Hermes; cp. Ramsay, *The Bearing of Recent Discovery on the Trustworthiness of the New Testament*, pp. 47-9; cp. Acts xiv. 12, Gal. iv. 14.

⁴ Cp. Poland, *Geschichte des Griechischen Vereinswesens*, S. 193.

⁵ Cp. Murray, *Four Stages of Greek Religion*, p. 74. Thoth was also the lord of rebirth; cp. Mead, *Thrice-Greatest Hermes*, p. 50 (Tat). "Tell me this too. Who is the author of Rebirth?" (Hermes); "The Son of God, the One Man, by God's Will"; cp. Mead, *Thrice-Greatest Hermes*, ii. p. 222, "The Secret Sermon on the Mountain," § 4.

⁶ Cp. Farnell, *The Cults of the Greek States*, v. pp. 28 ff.; cp. Mau, *Pompeii, its Life and Art*, pp. 88, 200.

⁷ Cp. Farnell, *op. cit.*, p. 17.

tutelary god of societies of merchantmen and young people.¹

The religion of Hermes was not so much a systematised cult as a "general devotion,"² a force calling devotion into being. It made an important contribution to the growth of social and international law.

As in the case of the Primitive Church, preaching formed an important part of the worship of the Hermes-cult. Its preachers were believed to be inspired by the god. And, as in the case of the early Christians, the devotees of Hermes lived in a world which was believed to be infested by demons—some good, some bad.³

In many ways the teaching of St. Paul is suggested by, though it is not claimed that St. Paul entirely derived his ideas from, the Hermetic teaching. All that may be asserted is that St. Paul, breathing the atmosphere of the Hermes-cult, must have been interested to find in it conceptions similar to his own, and that the consideration of these must have to some extent influenced his own thought. In various ways the possibility of this is shown. In the religion of Hermes, as in St. Paul's teaching, we find the recognition of the sublime truth that God is "all in all";⁴ that He is the Creator of Nature, not Nature the creator of Him;⁵ that all creation is originally

¹ Cp. Poland, *Geschichte des Griechischen Vereinswesens*, S. 192.

² "On ne trouve pas de trace, que je sache, au moins dans le monde latin, d'une secte hermétique avec un clergé et un culte"; cp. Cumont, *Les Religions orientales dans le paganisme romain*, pp. 274 n. 38, 275.

³ εἰσὶ δὲ τινες αὐτῶν <καὶ> κεκραμένοι ἐξ ἀγαθοῦ καὶ κακοῦ; cp. Reitzenstein, *Poimandres*, xvi. § 13; cp. The Definitions of Asclepius unto the King Ammon; The Perfect Sermon of Asclepius unto the King, §§ 10-18.

⁴ God "in Himself includes all Space, all Substance, and all Matter, of things producing and begetting, and all whatever is, however great it be"; cp. The Perfect Sermon, or the Asclepius, xvi. § 3; Mead, *Thrice-Greatest Hermes*, ii. p. 336. (In 1 Cor. xv. 28, St. Paul is rather thinking of the final and complete lordship of God; but that God was originally and in reality always "all in all," in spite of the stern fact of evil, was surely a doctrine at the foundation of St. Paul's conception of God.)

⁵ "Holy art thou, whose form Nature hath never made"; cp. *Poimandres*, 31 (Mead, *Thrice-Greatest Hermes*, ii. p. 19); cp. About the Common Mind of Hermes to Tat, § 22 (Mead, *op. cit.* p. 212).

good ;¹ and that it is associated with the breaking forth of light.²

In both, we find belief in the Fatherhood of God, and, though with a very considerable difference, the conception of man as being made in the likeness of God.³ The psychology of the Hermetic literature shows that the psychology of St. Paul was that of his environment.⁴ There is recognition, in both, of freedom, of personal choice,⁵ and, at the same time, predestination.⁶ In neither is there a serious attempt to reconcile the operation of these. In both, we find death associated with the sins and passions of the flesh,⁷ and yet with love,⁸

¹ Cp. (A letter) of Thrice-Greatest Hermes to Asclepius ; Unto Asclepius Good Health of Soul, § 7 (Mead, *Thrice-Greatest Hermes*, ii. p. 262). (Here the evil passions are compared to the rust of brass, which is, of course, not the brass itself.)

² "For when thou didst shine forth, Cosmos came into being, and light appeared" (from an invocation to Hermes as the spiritual light ; cp. Mead, *Thrice-Greatest Hermes*, p. 91).

³ "For that I am thy likeness" (from an invocation to Lord Hermes ; cp. Mead, *Thrice-Greatest Hermes*, p. 88). We find also that just as "Cosmos is made in the image of God, Man (is made) in the image of Cosmos" ; cp. That no one of Existing Things doth perish (Mead, *Thrice-Greatest Hermes*, ii. p. 128). In the Virgin of the World, the builder-souls who fashioned the primeval copies of the celestial types of animals grew proud of their work and overstepped the limits decreed by the Creator. To punish them, He made the human frame, wherein to imprison their disobedient souls (how different the Pauline conception !) ; cp. Mead, *Thrice-Greatest Hermes*, iii. p. 140.

⁴ Cp. Poimandres, § 17 (Mead, *Thrice-Greatest Hermes*, ii. p. 11). The constituent parts of the human self are mind (*νοῦς*), reason (*λόγος*), soul (*ψυχή*), spirit (*πνεῦμα*), body (*σῶμα*) ; cp. Mead, *Thrice-Greatest Hermes*, ii. p. 168 (The Key, § 13).

⁵ "We have the power to choose ; it is within our power to choose the better, and in like way [to choose] the worse, according to our will" ; cp. The Power of Choice, § 2 (Mead, *Thrice-Greatest Hermes*, iii. p. 85).

⁶ "The Mind, the Soul of God, doth rule o'er all—o'er Fate, and Law, and all things else." In the Hermetic literature, it is more the working of Fate, whereas in St. Paul's teaching, it is the operation of the Free Personal Will of God. "All works, my son, are Fate's ; and without Fate naught of things corporal—or good, or ill—can come to pass" ; cp. About the Common Mind of Hermes to Tat, §§ 5, 7 (Mead, *Thrice-Greatest Hermes*, ii. pp. 201–2).

⁷ Cp. Poimandres, § 19 ; About the Common Mind of Hermes to Tat, § 11 ; In God alone is Good, and Elsewhere Nowhere, § 3 ; Of Piety and (True) Philosophy, § 17 ; cp. The Key of Thrice-Greatest Hermes, § 18.

⁸ "And man that hath Mind in him, let him learn to know that he himself is deathless, and that the cause of death is love" ; cp. Poimandres, § 18 ; cp. the love of God implied in the sacrifice of Christ.

the frank recognition of the stern fact that punishment is meted out for sin,¹ the call to mortify the flesh,² and, in particular, to awake from drunkenness and sleep,³ and the intimate association of religion with morality.⁴

In both, God is regarded as the source of revelation. His mysteries, hitherto hidden, are now revealed.⁵ In ecstasy, the soul of man enters into closest communion with God.⁶ Though the salvation provided by Hermes differs essentially from that provided by Christ, Hermes too is a saviour of men.⁷ Corresponding to St. Paul's conception of sonship realised progressively through Christ Jesus, the Hermetic literature recognises the growth of the pious soul in likeness to God.⁸

What is the conclusion to which we come in regard to St. Paul and the Hermetic writings? It is this: if the Hermetic writings, as we have them, had existed *in toto* before St. Paul's time, the inevitable conclusion must have been that he was considerably influenced by the Hermetic teaching. But, since this is not the case, we cannot come to a conclusion as if it were. What we have to recognise, however, is that some at least of that literature was in existence before St. Paul's day, *e.g.* Poimandres, and that the Hermes religion was in the

¹ "But it is fated, too, that he who doeth ill shall suffer"; cp. About the Common Mind of Hermes to Tat, § 5 (Mead, *Thrice-Greatest Hermes*, ii. p. 202).

² Cp. Poimandres, § 22; cp. The Cup of Monad, § 6 ("Unless thou shalt first hate thy body, son, thou canst not love thyself").

³ "O ye people, earth-born folk, ye who have given yourselves to drunkenness and sleep and ignorance of God, be sober now, cease from your surfeit, cease to be glamourised by irrational sleep"; cp. Poimandres, § 27; cp. 1 Thess. v. 7, 8; cp. The Great Ill among Men is Ignorance of God, § 1.

⁴ "There is one way alone to worship God; [it is] not to be bad"; cp. About the Common Mind of Hermes to Tat, § 23.

⁵ Cp. Poimandres, § 16.

⁶ (Speaking of man's power to mount up into heaven itself.) "And greater thing than all; without e'en quitting earth, he doth ascend above. So vast a sweep doth he possess of ecstasy"; cp. The Key of Thrice-Greatest Hermes, § 25; cp. Reitzenstein, *Poimandres*, S. 361.

⁷ Cp. Mead, *Thrice-Greatest Hermes*, i. 86.

⁸ "For it is possible, my son, that a man's soul should be made like to God, e'en while it still is in a body, if it doth contemplate the Beauty of the Good" (words of Hermes); cp. The Key of Thrice-Greatest Hermes, § 6.

religious atmosphere which St. Paul breathed. Remembering this, and in view of all the evidence, is there not at least a strong presumption that St. Paul was to some extent influenced by the religion of Hermes ? ¹

Though allowing this, as we must, we are bound, at the same time, to recognise far-reaching differences between St. Paul and the religion of Hermes and the other Mystery religions. Even when using the same religious terminology and conceptions, St. Paul's usage is different from that of these religions, for the simple reason that he always employs them in such a way that he remains unswervingly loyal to the Personal Christ, Incarnate, Crucified, Risen, Exalted, and identical with the Holy Spirit.

Radically different were the respective conceptions of Deity. To the pagans, God was usually a stellar or vegetation deity, whereas to St. Paul, Jesus Christ was God, come to earth, living His human life, dying, risen, present evermore in the Pneuma. The pagan deities were mythical. Christ, to St. Paul, was an historical person.

There was also a difference of spirit in the respective religions. Whereas St. Paul conceived of the Christian as one always and necessarily marked by a spirit of humility, the pagan mystic regarded humility as an unbecoming weakness.

There is a wide difference between St. Paul and the Mystery religions, alike as regards their conceptions of the nature of the human ego, and its relationship to

¹ Cp. Mind unto Hermes (the "Way"), § 21; Poimandres, § 23 ("And now, pray, tell me further of the nature of the Way"); cp. Poimandres, § 32 (intimate association of personal belief and witness-bearing); cp. Poimandres, § 4 (the "groaning" of creation, cp. Rom. viii. 22); cp. The Cup or Monad (the mystical use of the cup); cp. The Perfect Sermon, xxiv. § 3 (the ethnological use of the word "Scythian," cp. Col. iii. 11); cp. The Secret Sermon on the Mountain, § 7 (list of vices, cp. St. Paul's lists); cp. The Cup or Monad, § 5 (the idea of life as a trying "sojourn," and death as the road to "release"; cp. similar idea in St. Paul). σὺ δέ μου καὶ τὰ ὑστερήματα ἀναπλήρωσιν; cp. Poimandres, xiv. § 1; cp. 1 Cor. xvi. 17. παλινγενεσία; cp. Poimandres, xiii. § 13; cp. Tit. iii. 5. λογικὴν θυσίαν; cp. Poimandres, xiii. §§ 18, 19, 21; cp. Rom. xii. 1.

deity. In Greek mysticism, the fact that the mystic felt himself to be a supernatural being, led to the recognition in himself of a double ego. It was, through feeling himself to be one with his god, that he realised his two-fold nature. The pagan mystic held the view, altogether abhorrent to the mind of St. Paul, that his lower ego was permitted to commit sin (*e.g.* murder, adultery), without in any way interfering with the life of the higher ego. In Greek mysticism, it is a new ego which becomes identical with God. In the Pauline system, it is still the old ego which possesses the Holy Spirit. Nowhere does St. Paul say that the Christian becomes the Holy Spirit.

In Greek mysticism, there is a sharp antagonism between the *ψυχή* and the *πνεῦμα*. In the Mithras liturgy, in order to become *πνεῦμα*, the *ψυχή* must be abandoned, in order, however, to be taken up again. In St. Paul, there is also a sharp distinction between the *ψυχή* and the *πνεῦμα*, but the *ψυχή* is never abandoned in this life. It is only through death that the psychological nature is finally destroyed (cp. 1 Cor. xv.). St. Paul, in opposition to the severance of the higher and lower self of the pagan Mysteries, always maintains the oneness of the human ego.

When we compare the mystical union of St. Paul with that of the Mystery religions, we find ourselves in a totally different atmosphere. The mystical union of St. Paul was a living communion and fellowship with Christ, who was God to him. The mystical union of the pagan mystic was identification with God, but only while in a state of ecstasy. The mystical union of St. Paul continued unbroken, whether the Christian was in, or out, of the ecstatic state. The mystical union of the pagan mystic ceased when one was no longer in the ecstatic condition. Emerging from the ecstatic state, the pagan mystic felt himself to be far away from God. St. Paul, on the other hand, never felt himself separated from his God. To St. Paul, there was always a clear

distinction between himself and the Person of God. To the pagan mystic, when in a state of ecstasy, this distinction ceased for the time being at least.

Still of the Hermetic teaching that may be said, which can, on the whole, be said of all the Mystery religions : St. Paul, with a genius which is instinctively practical, appreciated, and in measure appropriated, what was religiously and morally important in that teaching, identified what was of real spiritual worth in that doctrine with the positive teaching of the Gospel, linked it on to the personal and historic Jesus, and utilised it beneficially for the highest moral and spiritual needs of the human soul.

CHAPTER V

ST. PAUL AND THE PAGAN GUILDS

THE extraordinary part played by the Pagan Guilds in the religious and social life of the ancient world is being more and more realised on account of the manifold discoveries of modern times. It is to them, and to the Mystery religions, with which they were often intimately associated, that we must look for evidence of the religious life that was really alive, really a comfort and support to men facing the grim perplexities of human existence. These guilds had long existed, and, by the time of St. Paul, were spread far and wide over the whole civilised world. Their antiquity is testified to alike by the inscriptions and by literature.¹ The "Orgeones," which were local cult-societies, and the earliest examples of Greek guild life, were in existence as early as the fourth century B.C.² From that time onwards, there is a growing stream of evidence bearing witness to the vitality and influence of these brotherhoods.

In their types and varieties the guilds were legion. The history of their origin and growth illuminates the progressive change and development of social and religious life, and presents us with an efficient key to the understanding of the aspirations and efforts of the great

¹ Cp. Livy (186 B.C.), who describes guilds of devotees of Bacchus practising mystic rites ; cp. Sulla, who speaks of collegia of worshippers of Egyptian gods (Osiris, Isis) in Italy ; cp. Apul. *Metam.* xi. 30.

² Cp. ὀργεῶνες, cited by Poland, *Geschichte des Griechischen Vereinswesens*, SS. 9, 14. An ὀργεῶν was "a citizen chosen from every δῆμος, who, at stated times, had to perform certain sacrifices" ; cp. Liddell and Scott.

mass of downtrodden humanity, seeking better conditions of life and the solace of direct contact with Deity.

But while the variety and type is thus manifold, it is possible to classify the guilds in three main groups: (1) real societies, characterised by a distinct religious and social element; (2) professional colleges or guilds serving a professional purpose; (3) temporary associations of tradespeople combining for some definite object.

But, in addition to this generalisation, it is necessary to take note of the salient types individually. We have already referred to the "Orgeones," the earliest species of guild. These were associated with some hero—Aminos, Hypodektes, Dionysus.

Poland recognises two sides to these societies. On the one side, they were intimately bound up with the economy of the Attic people, and on the other, they were regarded as private associations.¹

The "Thiasotai" and "Thiasoi,"² while limited to a certain period of time and to a restricted area, were more comprehensive than the "Orgeones," and while it was not necessary that they should have any immediate connection with a specific religious cult, they tended to become both religious and mystical.

The "Eranistai"³ were of later origin than the "Orgeones" and "Thiasotai." They had mainly to do with monetary and business matters, and, for that reason, would be bound up closely with the common social life, and tend to be of a less permanent character than the two preceding.

¹ Cp. Poland, *Geschichte des Griechischen Vereinswesens*, S. 13. *ὄργεῶνες* and *θιασῶται* are not necessarily interchangeable terms; cp. *op. cit.* S. 12.

² Cp. Poland, *Geschichte des Griechischen Vereinswesens*, SS. 16-27. *θλασος* was applied to the colleges of mystics in the Black Sea district; cp. Poland, *op. cit.* S. 37.

³ Cp. Poland, *Geschichte des Griechischen Vereinswesens*, SS. 31-34. The "moneychangers" (Matt. xxi. 12) remind us of this type of guild. No money could be given in the Temple except it was Jewish coin. All Roman money had to be changed at the table controlled by the priests, who had thus a monopoly in the exchange. It is interesting to note that Lake (*The Stewardship of Faith*, p. 38) thinks the protest of Jesus against these men was "the immediate cause of the crucifixion."

The "Therapeutai" ¹ were perhaps not a guild in the strict sense of the word; but the term is rather a loose designation applied to religious devotees in general, and specially to the worshippers of a foreign deity.

The guilds of mystics, which arose in Asia Minor, where they probably took the place of the older "Thiasoi," were not of great importance so far as their specific fraternal life was concerned.² They are known to have existed in Pauline cities, such as Phillipi and Thessalonica, and, most interesting of all, in Tarsus itself.³

By the "Boukoloi" we are to understand associations addicted to ecstatic practices, such as the worshippers of Dionysus, and the Korybantes.⁴

The "Molpoi" and "Hymnodoi" were guilds of singers, who played an important part in public worship, and especially had to do with the cult of the Cæsar and the Dea Roma.⁵ This type of guild is known to have existed in Ephesus.⁶

There were various types of craftsmen guilds,⁷ such as workers in wool, purple-dyeing, and linen,⁸ and mercantile associations, which, while having a definite business purpose and object, were, at the same time, religious societies.⁹

¹ Cp. Poland, *Geschichte des Griechischen Vereinswesens*, S. 35.

² Cp. *ibid.* SS. 36-37.

³ "Auf einem Ring σύνδοτος μυστική Ταπρέων"; cp. Poland, *Geschichte des Griechischen Vereinswesens*, S. 39.

⁴ Cp. Poland, *Geschichte des Griechischen Vereinswesens*, S. 45.

⁵ Cp. ὑμνωδοὶ θεοῦ Σεβαστοῦ καὶ θεᾶς Ρώμης, in Hadrian's reign.

⁶ Cp. Poland, *Geschichte des Griechischen Vereinswesens*, S. 48.

⁷ The probability is that St. Paul was a member of a tentmakers' guild.

⁸ There were associations of "workers" (cp. ἐργάται in Ephesus), and of "fellow-workers" (cp. συνεργασία in Ephesus, and συνέργιον in Tarsus); cp. λανάρριοι in Ephesus, πορφυροβάφοι in Thessalonica, λινοουργοί in Tarsus. The term συμβιωταί was applied for the first time to the handicraft guilds in the time of the Cæsars; cp. Poland, *Geschichte des Griechischen Vereinswesens*, S. 50; cp. the Dionysian "Technitai" (e.g. in Ephesus); cp. Poland, *op. cit.* SS. 129, 146; cp. συνέδριον used of the handicraft guilds, Poland, *op. cit.* S. 156.

⁹ Cp. Poland, *Geschichte des Griechischen Vereinswesens*, S. 116 ("religiöse Kultvereine"). The temples of Sumer were business centres as well as places of worship; cp. the frieze of the sanctuary found at Tell-el-Obeid, near Ur.

In the time of the Cæsars, there were associations of physicians in Rome.¹ It is possible that St. Luke, who was so intimately associated with St. Paul, may have been a member of one of these.

When one remembers St. Paul's keen interest in athletics, it is interesting to find associations of "athletes," though these are, so far as known, of comparatively late date.²

The designation "Speira" is used of the Mystery guilds.³ The terms "Taxis" and "Phyle" are also employed in connection with the Mystery religions.⁴ The title "Synedrion" ⁵ is frequently applied to societies of old men,⁶ and bears a distinctively public character.

The name "Gerousia," found on inscriptions belonging to Thessalonica, Ephesus, Perga, and Tarsus, indicates an association which sought to safeguard and foster only the material interests of its members. In the time of the Cæsars, it played an important part in the municipal organisation of the cities of Asia Minor, and existed only with the permission of the Cæsars.⁷

When dealing with these Pagan Guilds, and inquiring how far they may have influenced St. Paul, one naturally raises the question whether there was anything of the nature of these guilds existing among St. Paul's own people. The Jewish communities of the Diaspora were certainly compactly organised. But they are not to be regarded as possessing colleges or guilds following the pattern of the pagan associations. They were rather separate communities of the same people, bound together,

¹ Cp. Poland, *Geschichte des Griechischen Vereinswesens*, S. 121.

² Cp. *ibid.* SS. 147 ff. Perhaps we should associate with these the *véoi*, the youth of a city, e.g. at Perga and Tarsus.

³ Poland, *op. cit.* S. 153.

⁴ Cp. Poland, *op. cit.* S. 154.

⁵ Cp. Poland, *op. cit.* SS. 156-7: "Vor allem ist das Wort die Bezeichnung für die *βουλή* in späterer Zeit."

⁶ e.g. at Ephesus.

⁷ Cp. Poland, *Geschichte des Griechischen Vereinswesens*, SS. 101-2. The Sanhedrin was called the *γερονσία* in the time of Antiochus Epiphanes (223-187 B.C.). It retained this title to the time of Hyrcanus II., in whose time the name *συνέδριον* appears; cp. Juster, *Les Juifs dans l'empire romain*, p. 401.

and exclusive in their attitude towards the Gentiles on account of their own peculiar traditions and nationality, and by their strict obedience to the revealed law of God. The model for the Christian communities of the Gentile Church is not to be sought in the synagogue, but in the Pagan Guilds. The Gentile converts, having decided to become Christian, would naturally bring with them the experience of association with the guild system, and would seek, in keeping with distinctive Christian doctrine and practice, to frame their congregational life as far as possible along the lines of the guild life with which they had previously been familiar, and which they had in measure found to be spiritually and morally helpful.

The very fact that the Pauline churches originated and grew up in the atmosphere of these Pagan Guilds, and that many of the members of the Gentile churches were originally members of these pagan brotherhoods, would be sufficient to convince us that, alike in their spirit, tone, and organisation, the Pauline churches were profoundly influenced by these guilds. There are striking similarities which cannot otherwise be explained. To begin with, the Pauline churches are essentially brotherhoods, Jesus Christ, the Risen Lord, being the Great Elder Brother. A Christian was not merely a brother to the other members of the particular Christian community to which he happened to belong, but a brother to all other Christians.¹ In keeping with this, there was a constant effort made to keep the various churches in living and affectionate touch with one another. The Christian communities were on a level of complete equality with one another, and, alike in Christian Church and Pagan Guild, individual members were equal. Both were marked by a robust, and even aggressive, democratic spirit.

Then there must have been a certain spirit of fellow-

¹ For the use of ἀδελφός in the papyri, cp. Milligan, *Greek Papyri*, p. 9 (Isias to Hephæstion, 168 B.C.), where ἀδελφός is equivalent to "husband"; cp. *Here and There among the Papyri* (Paris Papyri, No. 42, 156 B.C.; Turin Papyri, i., No. 1, 116 B.C.).

feeling between the Christian churches and many of the collegia or guilds as regards the civil authority. The inscriptions show that many colleges were like the Christian Church in not possessing legal recognition. The fact that there were such unlicensed guilds may partly explain how, in spite of its handicap in not being permitted, the Christian Church both survived and expanded.¹

In numerical strength, the early Christian communities would resemble these Pagan Guilds. There would never be, in any one of them, more than a fraction of the members of our large city congregations of to-day.

The term "ecclesia" itself was used by the Greek associations, and while St. Paul never loses sight of the catholic oneness of the "ecclesia," he frequently uses the plural "ecclesiai,"² denoting by the latter the individual Christian communities.

The designation "Presbyter," so frequently met with in the organisation of early Christianity, was also used by the guilds.³

¹ During the Republic, the right of association was probably freely allowed: "Dum ne quid ex publica lege corrumpant"; cp. Dig. xlvii. 22, 24. But under the Empire there was greater strictness. The hostility of the Roman government to the collegia was due to the fear that they might be used for anti-imperial political purposes. It showed itself fairly tolerant towards brotherhoods composed of the poorest and slaves, thinking that these would have practically no political influence.

The Lex Julia consisted of two parts: one dealing with the dissolution of collegia already existing, "praeter antiqua et legitima"; and another, with the granting of a licence by the senate or the emperor to form new collegia.

The Jews were in a much more favourable position than the Christians, as the regulations forbidding *θλασσοι* did not apply to the former. By holding the Agapæ or Love-feasts, the Christians were liable to be regarded as hetæria. It was because of this that the Agapæ were gradually given up, and only the Eucharist retained.

² For St. Paul's use of the singular, *ἐκκλησία*, for the whole Church, cp. 1 Cor. x. 32, xii. 28. For his use of the plural, *ἐκκλησίαι*, cp. Gal. i. 22; 1 Cor. xvi. 1, 19; 2 Cor. viii. 19.

³ Cp. Poland, *Geschichte des Griechischen Vereinswesens*, S. 414. The papyri show that the term *πρεσβύτερος* was used in a purely secular sense, as the "elder" of the village, i.e. of one who was responsible for the peace and good order of the village. Milligan, referring to these civil officials, says: "It is obvious that the use of the word in civil life to denote a local or village officer must have prepared the way in Gentile circles for its acceptance in its new

The Christian churches were religious associations, churches of the One Living and True God, and of Jesus Christ, God's Son. Now the names which the Pagan Guilds bore were merely symbolic ;¹ but these names very often linked them on unmistakably to some distinctive religious cult,² though you cannot always tell from the name with what particular cult each guild had to do. In a certain sense, it might even be claimed that all guilds were religious.³ The frequent use of the word " hieros " is an evidence of this.⁴

The Christians of the Pauline churches were strongly conscious of the indwelling of the Holy Spirit, through which they had faith, hope, and love, together with many other gifts and graces. This experience was no doubt different, not merely in degree, but in kind, from that of the members of the Pagan Guilds ; but the fact that the members of these guilds believed themselves to be in union with some particular deity, through whose influence they were exalted out of the misery and transitoriness of the present world, and were able, as it were, even here and now, to breathe the airs of immortality, was surely a preparation for the inner, spiritual Christian life.⁵

There is even precedent as regards the origin of the connotation " ; cp. *Here and There among the Papyri*, p. 65 ; cp. petition of a tax-farmer, 117 B.C., " the elders of the cultivators " ; cp. *Greek Papyri*, pp. 28 n., 75 n. Different from the " elders of the village " were the " elder-priests " ; cp. Milligan, *op. cit.* p. 83. For the important functions of " the elders " in primitive Egypt, cp. Moret et Davy, *Des Clans aux empires*, pp. 143-4, 151.

¹ Cp. Poland, *Geschichte des Griechischen Vereinswesens*, S. 5.

² e.g. Cybele, Sabazius, Men, Dionysus, Serapis, Isis, Asclepius, Bendis. " So finden wir etwa 100 Vereine in Griechenland, deren auf -*aorai* oder -*iorai* gebildete Bezeichnungen sich von Götternamen herleiten " ; cp. Poland, *Geschichte des Griechischen Vereinswesens*, SS. 62, 214 ff.

³ " In gewissem Sinne ist jeder Verein ein Kultverein, weil die religiösen Vorstellungen, vor allem die religiösen Feste fast überall von grosser Bedeutung sind " ; cp. Poland, *Geschichte des Griechischen Vereinswesens*, S. 5 ; cp. the *ἑργαῖρες* associated with some special shrine (Poland, *op. cit.* S. 13).

⁴ The word *ἱερός* is much used by the Mystery guilds. We hear of τὸ *ἱερὸν συνέδριον* at Tarsus, and frequently of the *ἱερὸν συνέδριον* at Ephesus. Cp. Poland, *Geschichte des Griechischen Vereinswesens*, S. 169.

⁵ The " *Thiasoi*," which were found in many Greek cities, particularly in seaports, may be regarded as doing special service in this way.

Christian God, looked at from the Gentile point of view. That God came, not from the Gentile pantheon, but from the Jews. He was a foreign God. There were several Pagan Guilds which maintained the cult of foreign gods.¹

When we remember the central position in the Pauline theology occupied by Jesus Christ, Crucified, Risen, Exalted, it is of peculiar significance to find that in most of these associations there were sacred dramas enacted, which set forth the passion, death, resurrection, and exaltation of a god.

In view of what was stated in the previous chapter on the Mystery religions, it is of special interest to find that very many of the Pagan Guilds were not only religious but mystical,² and were found in cities, such as Tarsus and Ephesus, with which St. Paul had specially to do.³ The "Phratra," "Speira," "Phyle," "Synodos," and, as regards Asia Minor, specially the "Thiasos," have to do with the Mystery religions.

In the Pauline churches we find vividly set forth the ideas alike of Christian family life and Christian citizenship. Both were to be ultimately and fully realised "in heaven";⁴ but the first-fruits of both were already reaped on earth. A healthy, helpful individualism was not discouraged in the Christian Church. It never has been. But individualism that was separatist in tendency, and productive of harm to the unity of the Christian life, was not only discouraged but forbidden. In various ways St. Paul shows this. He is an enemy of the class-spirit. He opposed the bringing of lawsuits by Christians before the pagan tribunals.⁵ He condemned the selfish and exclusive spirit sometimes shown at the Love-feasts.⁶ He

¹ e.g. the "Therapeutai."

² Cp. Poland, *Geschichte des Griechischen Vereinswesens*, S. 172.

³ Cp. *συνδὸν μυστικῆς Ταπείων* (on a ring found in Bulgaria). Cp. Poland, *Geschichte des Griechischen Vereinswesens*, SS. 84, 162, 210.

⁴ Cp. Phil. iii. 20. At a very early date, the Christians came to feel that their kingdom was at once the oldest and the newest. They were "the original people at the dawn of human history"; cp. Harnack, *The Expansion of Christianity*, i. p. 322.

⁵ Cp. I Cor. vi. 6, 7.

⁶ Cp. *ibid.* xi. 17 ff.

was horrified to find a divisive party spirit in the Church at Corinth.¹ Nothing could be tolerated that tended to disrupt the Christian family life. All Christians as such were children of God, brethren of Jesus Christ and of one another. The Christian life was a life of ideal friendship between God and the Christians and among the Christians themselves.² As brethren they were inspired by the spirit of mutual helpfulness in all matters that had to do with the material, moral, and spiritual life, reminding us of the responsibilities laid upon Freemasons. There were "strong" and "weak" ³ members of the Christian Church, and the true attitude of the former towards the latter was that of considerate love. All Christians, as such, were fellow-workers with one another and with God. There can be no doubt that much of this spirit had already found its home in the guilds.⁴

The custom of meeting in a suitable house, belonging to one of the Christian community, to "break bread," was anticipated by the practice of the Pagan Guilds having a house belonging to the brotherhood, where the

¹ Cp. *ibid.* i. 12 f.

² Poland points out that the *φίλοι* were not so much a "verein" properly so called, as rather a small group of real friends. In that way they anticipated the ideal of Christian friendship in the Church of God; cp. Poland, *Geschichte des Griechischen Vereinswesens*, S. 52.

³ The "weak" were those whose very moral earnestness led them to be unduly scrupulous—scrupulous about things that did not really matter, did not affect the great essentials of the Christian faith and life. The "strong" were those who had a firm grip of the essential facts of Christian doctrine and practice, and who felt that they were at liberty to exercise their right of freedom to any legitimate extent, that is, so long as they did not say or do anything that was obviously anti-Christian. The danger as regards them was not that they would do anything actually wrong, but something which, while not actually unlawful, might hurt the prejudices of those who were "weak."

⁴ Cp. the use of *συνέργιον* and *συνεργασία*. Speaking of the Mithraists, Cumont says: "Les initiés se considéraient tous comme les fils d'un même père, qui devaient se chérir d'une affection mutuelle"; cp. *Les Religions orientales dans le paganisme romain*, pp. 188 n. 75, 297. At the same time, it has to be observed that the idea of brotherhood was rather comradeship in arms than real brotherhood in the Christian sense.

Poland thinks that it is doubtful that the term *ἀδελφοί* was applied by pagans, except in the sense of real brothers belonging to one family. Cp. *Geschichte des Griechischen Vereinswesens*, SS. 54-55.

festival meal was eaten. This separate house of the guilds may be looked upon as a forerunner of the Christian church as a distinct building used purely for religious purposes.¹

When, in the Book of Acts, we read that the early Christians "shared all they had with one another,"² we must remember that this was a form of communism which had already been anticipated in the Pagan Guilds.³ By this Christian communism of the Early Church, we cannot understand a compulsory division of goods, but rather a spontaneous ministration to the wants of the Christian poor. The Christian communism, if it can be called by that name, was not a matter of forceful appropriation, but of spontaneous Christian love. It was understood that all should contribute freely to the common evening meal as they were able. This spirit was not confined to the members of each separate Christian congregation. In the post-apostolic age, brethren making a journey were hospitably entertained, wherever they went, for a day or two. If they decided to make a longer stay, they had to earn their own living; but the members of the congregation did their best to help them to find work. The beginnings of this practice were already in the Pauline churches.

Then there is a striking similarity between the Christian communities and the Pagan Guilds, both as regards the spirit of ready accommodation which they showed towards those who were outside, and the cosmopolitan nature of the people who constituted the membership. St. Paul, while the most decided of Christians in his allegiance to Christ, was, nevertheless, at the same time, "all things to all men." The same spirit characterised the priests of the Pagan Guilds. The abolition

¹ Cp. the guild use of the terms *διννητήριον* and *δειπνιστήριον*; cp. Poland, *Geschichte des Griechischen Vereinswesens*, SS. 464 ff.

² Cp. Moffatt's translation, Acts ii. 44.

³ Cp. the word *κοινόν* itself. This type was more common in pre-Christian than in post-Christian times, except in Egypt; cp. Poland, *Geschichte des Griechischen Vereinswesens*, S. 165.

of all ethnic and national distinctions, so far as religious standing was concerned, which characterised the Pauline churches, had been long anticipated in the pagan associations.¹ One of the salient marks of the early Christian Church was that, while the Christians felt themselves to be a people apart alike from Judaism and paganism, the Christians themselves could originally be either Jews or belong to any Gentile race on the face of the civilised world. St. Paul showed no narrow-minded spirit in his conception of the Christian's attitude towards the world of men still outside the Christian fold. He certainly objects decisively to the practice of going to sacrificial feasts in the heathen temples ; but he permitted intercourse on the part of Christians with the heathen in private houses, though perhaps with a certain amount of reluctance. In any case, once men and women had entered the Christian fold, all racial distinctions must be obliterated in the Catholic unity of the one Christian Church.²

Alike in the Pauline churches and in the guilds, we find the natural desire on the part of the poorest classes for the realisation of just democratic ideals, the well-justified demand on the part of the oppressed for greater personal freedom and a share of the decencies of life, the felt need that a fair respect should be shown to human personality as such, apart from all class distinctions. In both we find the overwhelming majority of the members people of the lowest classes.³ In both there was a sprinkling of the people belonging to the upper classes.⁴

¹ The earliest inscriptions in Attica having to do with the *θιασῶται* show that the members were to a very large extent of foreign extraction.

² Cp. Gal. iii. 28, v. 6, vi. 15 ; 1 Cor. xii. 13 ; 2 Cor. v. 17 ; Rom. ix.-xi. ; Eph. ii. 11 ff. ; Col. iii. 11.

³ Mau points out that the various benefactors of the temple of Isis at Pompeii were of " low social standing " ; cp. *Pompeii, its Life and Art*, p. 176. Later on, specially after Hadrian's time, the worship of Isis began to appeal to the upper classes. St. Paul's kindly championship of Onesimus is a typical example of the Christian attitude towards slaves ; cp. *Philemon*, 10 ff.

⁴ Cp., as regards the Pauline churches, Menzies, *The Second Epistle to the Corinthians*, p. x ; cp., as regards the guilds, " There were colleges in the imperial household," Dill, *Roman Society from Nero to Marcus Aurelius*, p. 267.

In both we find at once sanctuaries for the downtrodden poor, and spheres where better-class people, who had a genuine sympathy with the poor, could find an opportunity to show the kindly, brotherly human feelings which inspired them.

A great deal was done by Augustus for the amelioration of the hard lot of the poor, by his new and juster law in regard to bankruptcy, and by the better organisation of the police system. But, up to the time of Nero, the exclusive domineering spirit of the old Roman nobility continued.¹ Even in Cicero's time immorality was rampant among the better classes of Rome, though there were many exceptions.² Things had grown much worse in St. Paul's day. It was impossible for a beautiful young slave woman to retain her virtue, if her lord determined otherwise. Slaves had become specially numerous in the later years of the republic, because of the many campaigns, and the correspondingly large number of captives carried into slavery.³ Neither on the part of the victorious generals, nor on the part of the literary writers of the time, was there the slightest compassion shown for these unfortunates.⁴

Alongside of the slaves, there was a considerable body of free workers like St. Paul himself. So far as social recognition was concerned their position was only a shade better than that of the slaves, for all manual work and trading were regarded by the upper classes as dishonourable. Both Pauline Church and Pagan Guild opened up a new world of possibilities to their members. Freedom of speech was allowed, so long as good order was not inter-

¹ Cp. Ferrero, *The Ruin of Ancient Civilisation and the Triumph of Christianity*, p. 16.

² Cp. Warde Fowler, *Social Life at Rome in the Age of Cicero*, p. 157 ff.

³ The number of slaves was increased by kidnapping children and travellers, and, of course, by the large number of children born to slave parents.

⁴ After the day's work was done, the slaves on the great estates had their food flung to them like dogs, and they were then locked up for the night.

ferred with ;¹ the highest dignities were open to the lowliest, if they were thought worthy.² Choice by lot, which was believed to be, ultimately, the revelation of the will of Deity, was a feature of the life of both.³

The power of combined effort on the part of like-minded people must have exercised an educative influence of a healthy kind, and we know that the guilds by that power of collective effort were able to wield an important influence even on the political life.⁴ While there is no direct evidence of the existence of such an influence in the Pauline churches, we may be certain that, at a very early date in the Church's history, the Christians exercised a corresponding power, by supporting candidates who desired a purer morality in political and social life. In many respects the Christian Church and the Pagan Guilds were waging the same warfare in similar ways, seeking, in a world of social and economic injustice, to help men and women to forget, if even for a time only, the hardness of their lives, and to feel themselves to be real men and women, brothers and sisters.

¹ Cp. 1 Cor. xiv. 26 ff. One of the real problems of the Early Church was to guarantee freedom of speech, and, at the same time, maintain good order and secure edification. The general rule seems to have been that one must speak at a time, and, probably to prevent lengthy speeches, when the Spirit clearly moved another to speak, the former spokesman had to give place to him. It must have been particularly difficult in those meetings to get speakers to see that mere raving did not imply the Presence of the Holy Spirit, and, remembering the low intellectual and cultural standing of the members, self-opinionativeness, which is the child at once of ignorance and a defective brain, must have been a bugbear often present. That strenuous efforts were made to overcome the difficulties and secure edification is shown by 1 Cor. xii. 28, 31, xiv. 1-25.

² Cp. "The Mystery Guilds of Mithras," Dill, *Roman Society from Nero to Marcus Aurelius*, p. 613.

³ Cp. Acts i. 26. We may be practically certain that this practice was handed on to the Pauline churches. "Die Bestellung durch das Los (*λῆξαι*), finden wir im wesentlichen auf die Einsetzung des Priesters und der Priesterin beschränkt"; cp. Poland, *Geschichte des Griechischen Vereinswesens*, SS. 416 ff.

⁴ That the recommendation of candidates for the elections to public offices was often made by the guilds is shown by the placards on the walls at Pompeii; cp. Mau, *Pompeii, its Life and Art*, p. 384. Cumont thinks that the secret societies, being mainly recruited from the lowest classes, were liable to be hotbeds of espionage and centres of social and political agitation; cp. *Les Religions orientales dans le paganisme romain*, p. 100.

In the Christian Church both marriages and burials were religious functions. The burial of the dead by members of the Church was probably regarded as a Christian duty from the first. Ananias and Sapphira were no doubt unworthy members; but even to them burial by "the young men" was not denied.¹ An important part of the purpose of the guilds was "to ensure to each member a decent burial."² It is characteristic of the Roman influence that great importance was attached to the care of the dead and the place of burial by the guilds.³

It has often been urged that nothing has done greater service in the vindication of the just rights of womanhood than the Christian Church. This claim is abundantly made good. But it should not be forgotten that the way was prepared in an altogether admirable fashion by the work of the Pagan Guilds. There it was recognised, long before the coming of Christ, that there is no difference between man and woman in the eyes of God⁴—that the soul of both is equally dear to Him.

The dignity and duty of human labour, whether done by men or women, were emphasised alike by Pagan Guild and Christian Church. St. Paul himself, greatest of preachers, gave at the same time the best of examples as regards the dignity, duty, and delight of simple manual labour. No doubt his training in a Jewish home helped him greatly in this respect, for manual labour was highly esteemed in Judaism. But St. Paul was led by his understanding of Christianity to emphasise this, and to read a religious value into all work honestly and gladly performed. One of the purposes of St. Paul's letters to

¹ Cp. Acts v. 6 f.

² Cp. Cobern, *The New Archæological Discoveries and their Bearing upon the New Testament*, p. 83.

³ Cp. Poland, *Geschichte des Griechischen Vereinswesens*, SS. 503 ff., 529.

⁴ Cp. Poland, *Geschichte des Griechischen Vereinswesens*, SS. 20 (a "Thiasotenverein" at Salamis), 31-2 (the "Eranistai"); cp. Cobern, *The New Archæological Discoveries and their Bearing upon the New Testament*, p. 556 (the labour and social guilds in Rhodes).

the Thessalonians was to urge them not to neglect their daily tasks. In many ways we may see the influence of St. Paul's example and teaching in the subsequent history of the Church. The Christian catacombs are adorned with representations of the tools of labour. The word "operarius" became in the Christian Church a title of honour. The Christian Church did splendid service by its forceful condemnation of the common practice of idly loafing on the steps of the circus or theatre. It immeasurably exalted the conception of the purpose and ends of labour by teaching that the object of labour ought not to be purely selfish, but that work should be done because God Himself, who is the greatest of workers, has ordained that man should also labour; that all workers, toiling in the right spirit, are co-operators with God Himself; and that it is a privilege to be able to earn money, in order to aid the poorer, less able, or less fortunate brethren, and to further the spread of the gospel. Both Church and guild were nurseries where men and women were encouraged to do things for themselves and to do them in the right spirit. In both, men and women were influenced also to do what they could for others. One of the main reasons for the marked success of the religion of Mithras in the Occident was that the spirit of fraternity and charity was encouraged in the brotherhoods.¹ The contributions of the Christian Church and those of the guilds differed in two respects. Whereas the Christian contributions were weekly,² those of the guilds were probably monthly.³ And whereas the contributions, including an entrance fee, of the guilds were compulsory, those of the Christian Church were voluntary. There is a like difference

¹ It was all the more to the credit of the Mithraists, just as in the case of the early Christians, that their members were very poor. In earlier times their temple was only a cave hewn out of the rock, because they could not afford anything better. Cp. Cumont, *Les Mystères de Mithra*, pp. 175-6.

² 1 Cor. xvi. 2.

³ Cp. the *φορά*, *συμβολή*; Poland, *Geschichte des Griechischen Vereinswesens*, S. 494.

between the modern trades unions and the Christian Church. It must be added, however, that voluntary contributions to meet urgent necessities were encouraged in the guilds, and voluntary liberality came to be a characteristic of their life in the time of the Cæsars.¹

Both Church and guild were schools of moral discipline, in which a certain *esprit de corps* was nourished. In the Christian Church, it was believed that the presence of the Holy Spirit in the heart of the individual was sufficient to ensure the existence of this. It was encouraged and fostered by the prevailing belief that faith and morals were inseparably bound up together, and by the felt call in the new life for members to aid one another in all that would tend towards the realisation of the Christian ideal. Discipline was enforced by penalties appropriate to the offence being exacted. In the guilds, the customary punishment was a fine.² In the Christian Church, the punishments were rather of the moral type. In both Church and guild, excommunication was resorted to in extreme cases. In the Church at least, the democratic spirit was maintained in dealing with such matters, through the penalties being determined by vote.³

When we consider, alongside of each other, the Pagan Guilds and the primitive Christian communities, we discover that it is not only that there are striking similarities in purpose and usage ; but we must recognise that these guilds contributed a very large share towards determining the character of the Christian communities, and indeed their work is to be regarded as part of the providential preparation of God for the coming of organised Christianity, as truly as the preparation of Judaism and the Old Testament.

¹ Cp. Poland, *Geschichte des Griechischen Vereinswesens*, S. 498.

² Cp. *ibid.* S. 448.

³ Cp. 2 Cor. ii. 6.

CHAPTER VI

RELIGION, MORALITY, SALVATION

RELIGION is not merely a matter of faithful attendance at the sanctuary, a ritual solemnly observed, a compendium of doctrine, a creed professed, the private devotions of the closet, obedience to a certain moral code, membership of a religious community or church, a faith, a hope, an outlook on the world, a spiritual propaganda. It is all these things and more. It touches, colours, and influences all possible relations of life, our attitude towards ourselves and towards our neighbours and God, our conceptions of politics, economics, philosophy, science, and literature. The reason for this is at once recognised when we bear in mind that religion essentially determines man's relationship with that God who is all in all.

St. Paul had this larger view of religion. To the Christian life, as he understood it, there was nothing alien in interest. It was a life which embraced in its consideration everything in heaven and earth, though not always with approval or sympathy.

St. Paul's religion had to do with the State.¹ He was a good Roman citizen, justly proud of the distinction. Yet he was probably not patriotic towards the Roman empire, in the same way as the descendant of worthy English or Scottish parents is patriotic towards the British empire. Roman citizen as he was, he was still

¹ The intimate connection between religion and the State was a characteristic not only of Greece and Rome, but, as early as the third millennium B.C., religion and government were inseparable alike in Egypt and in Babylonia; cp. Rostovtzeff, *A History of the Ancient World*, p. 43.

the descendant of a long line of Jewish fathers. But he believed that it was under the Providence of God that the Roman empire had arisen, and he had reason to be grateful to that empire for the rights of citizenship which he possessed and for the protection which it gave to him in the prosecution of his life's work.

St. Paul's attitude is largely to be explained by the political atmosphere in which he grew up. He was a child of the Diaspora. The Jews of the Diaspora enjoyed extraordinary privileges for which they had abundant reason to be thankful to the Roman power.¹ They were not asked to pay taxes in the sabbatical year. Jewish soldiers were exempted from military services on their sabbath and during their festivals, and were allowed to have their own special food, just as the Jews in general were allowed to have their own markets manned by their own officials, their own shops, baths, and cemeteries. They were not forbidden to speak Hebrew, though, as a matter of fact, they usually employed the language of the people among whom they were located. They had the right of assembly for public worship, and protection in the exercise of this right, in the Greek cities. This was guaranteed to them by Julius Cæsar and his immediate successors. They were at liberty to offer sacrifice, observe their sabbaths and festivals, and make pilgrimages to Jerusalem. They were permitted to pray, chant, and read their sacred books, and their libraries were protected. They were allowed to have their "arca communis" (a community money chest), and to spend the money from it on such things as public worship, the maintenance of officials, charity, building of synagogues, and the care of cemeteries. The Romans respected the right of the Jews to send contributions to Jerusalem. To steal that money was accounted "sacrilgium." They were also permitted to contribute money for the support of the patriarch, the "aurum coronarium."

¹ For a full account of the privileges of the Jews of the Diaspora, cp. Juster, *Les Juifs dans l'empire romain*, i. pp. 350 ff.

For a long time they were not compelled to adore the image of the emperor, and, only under Caligula, was it ordained that statues of the emperors should be placed in the synagogues. They had their own elementary schools, which were provided and kept up by the community, and were attended by the poorer class of Jewish children. They were not required to appear before pagan tribunals on the Sabbath or on festival days.¹ They were probably freed from the obligation of using the official pagan oath.² And up to Caligula's time, they were excused from attendance at the spectacles.³

In response to the extraordinarily considerate spirit of the Empire towards the Jews of the Diaspora, it is not surprising to find a general feeling of gratitude. In this respect they differed from the majority of the Jews still resident in Palestine, who both hated and distrusted the Romans, and still cherished what is the core of the Messianic hope expressed in the Book of Daniel, namely, the ultimate universal dominion of the saints, or faithful Israelites. In many ways the Jews of the Diaspora showed their spirit of appreciation. They did not grudge the emperors their customary titles of honour,⁴ nor did they refuse to use words in regard to them which indicated their grace and philanthropy.⁵ They took the oath of fidelity to the emperor. They celebrated the imperial fêtes, though in their own way. They prayed for the emperor in their synagogues. And, while they did not build heathen temples, they dedicated their synagogues to the Cæsars. The Jews of Tarsus were specially noted for their loyalty. All this helps us to understand the influence of St. Paul's Jewish environment on the formation of his conception of the relationship of the Christian Church to the State.

Then, of course, there was the pagan element in St. Paul's surroundings, and paganism had its own

¹ Cp. Juster, *op. cit.* ii. p. 121.

² Cp. *ibid.* ii. p. 124.

³ Cp. *ibid.* ii. p. 240.

⁴ e.g. βασιλεύς, Σεβαστός (Augustus), Κύριος (Dominus), Σωτήρ, Εὐεργέτης.

⁵ χάρις, φιλανθρωπία.

distinctive views of the relationship of religion and the State. In this sphere, too, we must think of St. Paul as an ardent student. We know that St. Paul was familiar with Epicurean teaching, and it is interesting to find that the Epicureans, like him, regarded the State as a valuable protector, though there was a vital cleavage between St. Paul and the Epicurean, inasmuch as the latter did not live for the State or society, but for himself alone. It may be said also that there was a difference between the attitude of the Oriental religions, generally speaking, and St. Paul. These former did not aim at maintaining the well-being of the State or the stability of society, but at the ceremonial and moral purification of the individual initiate, and the guarantee to him of a blessed hereafter in substantial identification with his god. St. Paul, while certainly seeking above all things to win souls for Christ, earnestly desired all that was good for the State and society. There were pagan brotherhoods which were State institutions, seeking the greater efficiency of national and social life.¹ There is an echo, if a somewhat late one, of St. Paul's injunction to "render honour to whom honour is due,"² in one of the Hermetic writings.³ We do not find in St. Paul, however, the idea that is presented in another of the Hermetic writings, according to which the souls of kings are derived from a region superior to that from which other souls come.⁴

It cannot be said that in St. Paul's day there was any great stimulus towards the production of sound patriotism, as we understand the word. From the time of Julius Cæsar, who installed some of his household as officers of the mint, freedmen had an important say in

¹ Cp. the ἑφηβοί. All Greek lands were represented by these. In particular, cp. ἐφηβαρχῶν (Thessalonica); ἐφηβαρχήσας (Colossæ); ἐφήβαρχος (Perga); cp. Poland, *Geschichte des Griechischen Vereinswesens*, S. 92. "Die Ephebie . . . ist natürlich eine staatliche Institution, die für die militärische Erziehung noch unselbständiger Bürger sorgte" (Poland, *op. cit.* S. 89).

² Cp. Rom. xiii. 7.

³ Cp. The Encomium of Kings, which Reitzenstein dates 302 A.D.

⁴ Cp. The Virgin of the World, § 40 (Mead, *Thrice-Greatest Hermes*, iii. p. 126).

the management of public affairs,¹ and, under Caligula, Claudius, and Nero, the dominance of the imperial freedmen was supreme.² This state of affairs inevitably stultified the spirit of patriotism, because it robbed men of ability of the opportunity of doing service to the State. Fawning servility was the order of the day, and the only way to win imperial favour, and indeed the only means of safeguarding personal property and privileges. The fact that the Cæsars were regarded as gods intensified the evils of this state of affairs.³ In the case of St. Paul, who was at once a Jew by descent and a Christian by conviction, the difficulties of the situation were increased by the fact that, on conscientious grounds, both Jew and Christian were antagonistic to the pagan religions in general, and to the worship of the emperors in particular.

In the Book of Acts there is clear evidence that an effort is made to show that the Roman officials were favourable to the Church.⁴ This is in harmony with St. Paul's position, as shown in his letters. He disagreed with the view of the Jewish Apocalyptic and the Apocalypse of St. John, which regarded the world-state as diabolic. St. Paul took the large, true view of the Roman empire. It had been called into existence by Almighty God, the God of Providence, to serve His own all-wise purposes. It was the sustainer of law and order, the protector of all right-living men and women, "that which restrains"⁵ all that is violent and lawless, "a minister of God"¹ fulfilling His behests, worthy of the respect

¹ Cp. Suetonius, *Julius Cæsar*, lxxvi.; *Claudius*, xxviii.-xxix.; Mommsen, *History of Rome*, bk. v. ch. xi.

² Speaking of St. Paul's time, Dobschütz says: "The Emperor, with his freedmen and slaves, managed public affairs"; cp. *Christian Life in the Primitive Church*, p. 365.

³ St. Paul hints at the worship of the reigning emperor in 2 Thess. ii. 1-12.

⁴ e.g. Acts xii. 6 ff. (Sergius Paulus), xvi. 37, xvii. 5 ff., xviii. 12 ff., xix. 35 ff., xxii. 24 ff., xxiii. 23 ff., xxvii. 43, xxviii. 16, 30. Johannes Weiss holds that the chief purpose of Acts is to put the Christian Church right with the Roman government.

⁵ Cp. 2 Thess. ii. 7.

and trust of all law-abiding people. The ultimate and real state of the Christians was heaven ;² but, in the meantime, it was clearly their duty to try to be worthy and loyal citizens of the Roman empire, ungrudgingly paying their share of the taxes. There have been many receipts of taxes, paid by weavers, found, and there can be little doubt that St. Paul paid his dues like the others. To Jesus, living in Palestine, Rome was a foreign power. To St. Paul, citizen of the world, the Roman empire was ordained of God, the champion of law and order, the protector to whom he gratefully owed a comparatively peaceful opportunity of carrying on that missionary work so dear to his heart. To him it was right to pay the tribute imposed, and to pray for the emperor, as the God-ordained head of the Empire.³ It has always to be kept in mind that the conditions for St. Paul's friendly attitude towards the Roman empire were much more favourable than they became afterwards. The Roman authorities did not, for a considerable time, recognise the true nature of the new religion. When it became quite clear to them that Christianity was essentially antagonistic to Cæsar-worship, recognising only one Lord, Jesus Christ, and that Christianity could not in any way be regarded as a distinctively national religion, persecution became inevitable.

One of the facts about St. Paul that particularly impresses the student of his letters, is the most intimate connection in his thought and practice between religion and morality. For this there was preparation alike in paganism and Judaism. Friedländer finds that morality

¹ Cp. Rom. xiii. 1 ff.; cp. 1 Peter ii. 13 ff., which is Pauline in spirit. The Pauline attitude is adopted by Justin and Melito. The opposite view is characteristic of Hippolytus and Tertullian.

² Cp. Phil. iii. 20.

³ In the oldest written prayer of post-apostolic times (recovered by Bryennios from the ancient monastery in Jerusalem, 1875), there is this reference to rulers: "Grant unto them, therefore, O Lord, health, peace, concord, stability, that they may administer the government which Thou hast given them without failure, . . . that, administering in peace and gentleness with godliness the power which Thou hast given them, they may obtain Thy favour."

was most intimately connected with religion in classical times,¹ and holds that too much has been made of the argument that the immoralities of the gods led men to commit sin.² In Greece, leadership in religion and morality, as in philosophy, science, and literature, remained in the hands of the laity. Philosopher and poet in the Hellenic world took the place of prophet and priest in the Semitic. It was they who determined the character of popular religion and morality.³ To Plato, religion and morality were inseparably bound up together. This line of thought was, however, not always followed. Posidonius held that religious observances, particularly the purifications associated with initiation, were not necessary to secure immortality. In some of the Mystery religions these purifications were not necessarily of a lofty moral character. But the tendency was towards emphasising the moral element.⁴ We cannot tell whether originally the Orphics required moral as well as material purification from the initiates. What really mattered was initiation into the sacred rites, and knowledge of the magical formulæ, repetition of which secured entrance into the blessedness of the life to come. But, after taking part in the mystic sacrifice, where a living animal was torn in pieces and devoured, the initiate must observe absolute chastity, and wear linen garments, symbolic of purity. Salvation could only be secured by the develop-

¹ Cp. *Roman Life and Manners under the Roman Empire*, iii. p. 215; cp. Rostovtzeff, *A History of the Ancient World*, p. 382.

² "The gods, like the great ones of the world, have a public and a private character. In the former they are the upholders of morality, in the latter they follow only their own inclinations; but only in their public character have they anything to do with men"; cp. Constant (Friedländer, *Roman Life and Manners under the Roman Empire*, iii. p. 215).

³ Cp. Rohde, *Psyche*, ii. pp. 222 ff.; cp. Cornford, *Greek Religious Thought*, p. xiii. The Greek "theologos" was a poet divinely inspired by the Muses. The priests of the Oriental cults were exclusively priests. In this they differed from the priests of the Roman religion, who, in civil life, took an active part in secular affairs. The Oriental priests were "médecins de l'âme"; cp. Cumont, *Les Religions orientales dans le paganisme romain*, p. 53.

⁴ Cp. Ramsay, *The Bearing of Recent Discovery on the Trustworthiness of the New Testament*, pp. 175 ff.

ment of a complete "Orphic life."¹ In the Eleusinian Mysteries, it was not on ethical grounds that an initiate had the assurance of immortality, nor had the rites any appreciable moral effect on the life of the initiates;² but, on the other hand, only those who were free from crime could take part in the Mysteries.

The religion of Isis did not commend itself to the world by a lofty morality. Her temples had an evil association because of the sexual impurities associated with them. But in later times, and in keeping with the general movement, the religion of Isis tended more and more to place moral purity alongside of ritualistic cleanliness, to urge the necessity to obtain forgiveness of sins, and to emphasise the conception of future retribution.

There is the most striking similarity between the morality of Christianity and the morality of Mithraism. Mithras was the god of truth, justice, and purity.³ It was not merely that the Mithraists had virgins living under strict vows of continence;⁴ but, just as in the case of the Christians, it was imperative that every one should be under the rule of self-control, continence, abstinence. Like Christianity also, the influence of Mithraism was towards the production of manliness, love of the truth, and the spirit of discipline necessary for a successful struggle in the moral conflict. The purity, which was the ultimate goal striven for in the Mithraic life, was spiritual in character, and resembled the purity of the Christian Church.⁵

That the ideal of a loftier morality was cherished in the Hermetic religion is shown by the demand

¹ Cp. Rohde, *Psyche*, ii. S. 125 (ὁρφικὸς βίος). In Orphism, "the body is regarded as evil," "and the soul suffers from imprisonment within it"; cp. Farnell, *Greek Hero Cults and Ideas of Immortality*, p. 381; cp. Kern, *Orphicorum Fragmenta*, p. 61 f. (212-19).

² Cp. Rohde, *Psyche*, i. SS. 295, 312, ii. S. 74.

³ It was because of its stern, disciplinary, pure character that the Mithraic ethic appealed so forcibly to the Romans.

⁴ Cp. Porphyry, *de autro nymph.* c. 15.

⁵ "De tous les cultes orientaux . . . aucun n'eut une pareille élévation morale"; cp. Cumont, *Les Religions orientales dans le paganisme romain*, p. 428; cp. Reinach, *Cultes et religions*, ii. pp. 220 ff.

for a sincere and thorough repentance expressed in Poimandres.¹

In pagan morality there was much that must have been abhorrent to the mind of St. Paul alike as a Jew and a Christian, and also much that must have commended itself to him. That he was familiar with the peculiar sins of paganism is shown by the first chapter of Romans.² But probably, neither as a Jew in his pre-conversion days, nor certainly as a Christian, would St. Paul adopt the view that the Gentiles, being idolaters, were therefore necessarily sinners in a special way. We cannot conceive of him agreeing with the average Jew of Palestine in thinking that idolatry and whoredom were inseparably bound up together.³ St. Paul had the advantage of knowing at first hand a better side of the Gentile world. He had the first condition of a sane religious outlook, the power to see the good where good really was. Sectarian narrow-mindedness in the life of modern Christians is a curse, because too often it has the jaundiced view of the man who thinks he discovers evil where there is really innocence. The evil is in the sectarian's own mind.

That St. Paul owed much of his conception of morality to Judaism, there can be no doubt. He was brought up under the august shadow of the Law. By prophets, like Amos, it was clearly recognised that religion without a corresponding morality was a fraud. The prophets did an epoch-making work in bringing fully to the light the ethical character of Yahweh. St. Paul clearly shows the influence of their work in his lucid and firm conception of the moral nature of the Pneuma actively at work in the hearts of the Christians.

That religion and morality should always be insepar-

¹ Cp. § 27. (It is possible, however, that this is a later interpolation.)

² Special Greek sins with which St. Paul must have been familiar were: (1) private quarrels and a tendency to go to law among the upper classes; (2) lying and cheating among the lower classes; (3) unnatural vice and fornication among all classes.

³ One redeeming feature of the outlook of the rabbis was that they were willing to accept men of any nationality as proselytes provided they were prepared to fulfil the whole ceremonial law.

ably bound up together is a marked conviction of the Early Church as a whole. It is an essential part of the teaching of Jesus Himself. It was an integral portion of the Christian tradition which came to St. Paul. Like Christ also, St. Paul laid emphasis, not on the metaphysical, but on the religious and moral elements of life. To him theology, religion, and morals were inseparable.¹ The Christian life was to him almost entirely religious and ethical.² To St. Paul the Christian, legal morality was abolished, and, in its place, the Christian man determined his ethical conduct in the light of Christ's own example, and as guided by the energising Holy Spirit. To live rightly was for the Christian to live in Christ and Christ to live in him. True religion and right morality were indissolubly bound up together. There can be little doubt that, if St. Paul's ideal of the Christian religion were fulfilled, if the Christian religion and Christian morality were effectively realised, every Christian man would do the right thing under all conditions of life, just because he is a Christian.

Baptism was the initial step in this new and better life. It implied forgiveness of sins.³ Not only that, but it meant voluntary abandonment for ever, on the part of the convert, of the old life of sin, and a free declaration by the convert that henceforth he cast in his lot with the followers of Christ, the men and women of the faith. We may take it for granted that already before baptism there was the presence of personal faith and the experienced operation of the Holy Spirit. A man must surely be already a patriotic citizen before he freely takes his oath to be a faithful soldier of his king and country and dons his uniform.

The real Christian life, being thus begun by forthwith getting quit of sin and its curse, should proceed, according

¹ Cp. Weiss, *Das Urchristentum*, S. 321.

² "Das gesamte christliche Leben wird dem Paulus eine kultische Festfeier"; cp. Bousset, *Kyrios Christos*, S. 147.

³ "Baptism was essentially the act by which past sins were entirely cancelled"; cp. Harnack, *The Expansion of Christianity*, i. p. 486.

to St. Paul, along lines of true sanity and real progress. St. Paul was no extremist. His teaching in regard to morals was not deformed by the morbidities of many would-be reformers, who fail to see that, in their wholesale condemnation of things that in themselves are either harmless or even useful, they are supporting a metaphysic which is actually based on the blasphemy that the world and what it contains are the devil's work. St. Paul, for example, puts a world of difference between the legitimate use of food and drink and gross indulgence. The former is a necessity; the latter is suicide. Sane in such matters as these, he was equally sane in not expecting more than was possible from the individual Christian life even when it was genuinely Christian. He never meant men to understand by the Christian life that it could be in this world an absolutely sinless life, even if baptism did imply complete wiping away of personal sin to begin with. No, the after-life of the baptized was at most to St. Paul, not a sinless, but a sin-conquering life, the history of a constant, persistent, relentless, and, on the whole, successful warfare with sin. In the conflict of great or smaller nations, there comes a time, usually, when there can be no doubt as to what ultimately the result must be. The cause of the inferior side is, to all intents and purposes, a lost cause. But it does not follow that the side destined to win the final and complete victory does not, from time to time, receive a nasty, if not fatal, set-back.

Living in a world which is God's, even though he may not yet have discovered this all-important fact, in a world occupied by his fellow-men, where he finds himself, man has got to fashion some kind of working morality. He has a long way to go before he finds out that all human righteousness is ultimately derived from God, a long way to go before he has ascended by the way of tribal customs and manners, and particularly tabu, to the ethic of St. Paul.

For his conception of the moral life, St. Paul was a

debtor to several sources.¹ Yet, whatever the sources were, so far as he himself was concerned, that conception was remarkably clear and complete. His real difficulty was in getting his Gentile converts to rise to his own lofty standard.² The difficulty, however, was not altogether one due to the circumstances of the age. It is perennial, we might say human.

Friedländer has done much to show that it is easy to take a jaundiced view of the immorality of ancient Rome.³ Life was not altogether bad. There was a common love of free nature. The inequalities in regard to wealth and poverty were not more pronounced than now, and, through the clientele system, support was given as a duty to those in need.⁴

Still, immorality was rampant. If the first chapter of Romans is a one-sided picture of Gentile morality in St. Paul's day, it is at least a true picture. Yet, even in that picture, St. Paul finds traces of good in the Gentile world. He would probably have at once acknowledged himself a debtor to the Gentile world even in the field of morals.

Still, in all that is ethical in St. Paul, we feel that he is essentially the Jew. He is the scrupulous, conscientious, virile Jew. Even while he recognises that righteousness is the pure gift of God, there is no question of slackness as regards personal effort. The immediate result of entering into the life of faith, the life of the Holy Spirit, is a

¹ "The early Christians owed some of their noblest instincts to Orphism"; cp. Harrison, *Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Religion*, p. 505.

² Aristides gives a picture of what may be regarded as the ideal state, not always realised (e.g. the picture of the house of a prominent Christian in the *Shepherd of Hermas*, which was disorderly, unchaste, and slanderous). According to Aristides, the following are some of the marks of the Christians: obedience to Christ's commands, personal purity, business honesty, high ideals of family life, treating slaves as brethren, kindness to widows, orphans, strangers, gratitude to God for all His mercies, making no display because of their good deeds.

³ The exaggerated idea of the luxury and extravagance of ancient Rome originated with the work of Meursius (1605), *Roma luxurians sive de luxu Romanorum*.

⁴ Cp. *Roman Life and Manners under the Early Empire*, pp. 131 ff., 176, 219-28.

strenuous upspringing of a will to serve. Living in the world, the Christian in his moral behaviour must be a man of God. He cannot be of that world, but must try to win that world to God. He has the faith that goodness is more powerful than evil, and must conquer in the end. He is out to fight the prevailing sins of the Gentile world—selfishness, revenge, and impurity. His morality is inspired by the Spirit that guides him, the Spirit of love, hope, joy, charity, sympathy, patience, kindness, constancy, chastity, prayerfulness. The authority to whom he makes final appeal is the Holy Spirit operative alike in the individual Christian and in the Christian community. The Holy Spirit is the guiding principle in determining the social ethic, alike as regards the life of the Church within itself, and as regards its relationship to those outside.

As St. Paul's morality in general is distinctly of Jewish type, so, in particular, is his conception and conviction of sin. It is not to Hellenism that we must turn for the secret of St. Paul's intense passion to preach sin and repentance. That was the message of the Baptist. It is Jewish. Hellenism had indeed been compelled to recognise the stern facts of sin and consequent suffering, and had rightly recognised that Zeus is not responsible for these.¹ The moral world of the *Odyssey* is, however, altogether different from that of St. Paul. Equally alien is the moral indifference of deity as understood by Heraclitus.²

¹ Cp. *Odyssey*, i. 26. The sense of sin goes very far back in the history of religion; cp. Babylonian texts quoted by King, *Babylonian Religion*, pp. 212 ff.; cp. Jastrow, *Religion of Babylonia and Assyria*, pp. 291, 312 ff. The Babylonian gods were believed to punish wrongdoing (injustice and oppression); cp. King, *Babylonian Religion*, pp. 217 ff. In one of the Penitential Psalms we read: "My goddess, my sins are seven times seven, forgive me my sins." The Babylonian Penitential Psalms may go back to the time of Hammurabi; cp. Jastrow, *Religion of Babylonia and Assyria*, pp. 317, 322. In the Babylonian story which resembles Job, found in Asshurbanipal's library, and belonging to the series of tablets entitled "I will praise the Word of Wisdom," Tâbi-utul-Bêl, king of Nippur, says: "My sins, he [Bêl] caused the wind to carry away."

² "To God all things are fair and good and right; but men hold some things wrong and some right. Good and evil are one"; cp. *Frgs.* 102, 58 (Cornford, *Greek Religious Thought*). "There is no

That there could be a sense of sin in paganism is shown by the papyri,¹ and there too we find words reminiscent of St. Paul with a distinctively moral meaning.²

In the Hermetic writings sin occupies a prominent place. Various forms of evil are recognised.³ Sin is due to the choice of evil things instead of good.⁴ The hopeless state of sinful man is recognised. He is "enwrapped with every kind of bad and thinks the bad good."⁵

There is a striking similarity in certain respects between the conception of sin held by Philo and St. Paul. Both start from the actual experience of sin in the world of men. Both regard the body as not bad in itself, but find the origin of sin in the passions of the flesh. Both assert the freedom of personal choice, and see in sin the deliberate preference of the lower for the higher.

To St. Paul it is an appalling fact that sin is everywhere. "All have sinned, and come short of the glory of God."⁶ This is the teaching of the Old Testament.⁷ It is part of his Jewish heritage. Not only is sin universal, but that it should be so is in accordance with a decree of God.⁸

Sin, in itself, is at once yielding to the lower fleshly nature, and a transgression of the Divine command. But there is a past history, reaching far back. It is not Pauline teaching that God is the author of sin.⁹ The entrance of

positive evil; it only comes by absence of good"; Sallustius, *On the Gods and the World*, xii. (Murray, *Four Stages of Greek Religion*).

¹ Cp. Milligan, *Here and There among the Papyri*, p. 109. As far back as Euripides we find a protest against the sins of the gods; cp. *Ion*, 429; Bellerophon, *Frag.* 292.

² e.g. ἀσυνετόμενος, said of a prodigal youth (from a copy of a public notice, A.D. first to second centuries); cp. ἀσυντία, Eph. v. 18; Tit. i. 6. ἀποπον, lit. "out of place," but here "amiss," i.e. in a moral sense (from the same notice); cp. 2 Thess. iii. 2; cp. Milligan, *Greek Papyri*, pp. 71-2.

³ Cp. The Secret Sermon on the Mountain, § 7.

⁴ Cp. The Cup or Monad, § 8.

⁵ Cp. In God alone is Good, and Elsewhere Nowhere, § 6.

⁶ Rom. iii. 23. Cp. In God alone is Good, and Elsewhere Nowhere, § 4: "For that the world is fullness of the bad."

⁷ Gen. viii. 21.

⁸ e.g. the sin of unbelief; cp. Rom. xi. 32.

⁹ For the belief that the gods are really good, and that the sins attributed to them are the sins of men themselves, cp. Euripides, *Iphigeneia among the Taurians*, 380; *Trojan Women*, 969.

sin into the life of men was due to Adam's fall.¹ In the same way came death.² It is sometimes maintained that St. Paul sets forth a precise doctrine of original sin. But all that he says is that it was through Adam's transgression that sin first entered into the life of men. He does not say that Adam's sin is actually handed on to all his descendants. It is death that is handed on, and even death is, in each case, not the immediate penalty of Adam's sin, but is immediately due to each man's own sin. It is a remarkable fact that in putting so much emphasis on Adam's transgression, St. Paul departs from the tradition of the Old Testament, where, after the initial narrative of the Fall at the beginning of Genesis, Adam's sin and its after effects are ignored.³ Of course we must keep in mind that it has a place in the apocryphal literature of Judaism.⁴

St. Paul's conception of the origin of evil differs in marked respects from much that we find in the thought of paganism. He does not believe that there has been a principle of evil existing from all eternity.⁵ It is God who is altogether good, who alone has existed from all eternity. Nor does St. Paul hold the view that there was, far back in human history, a time of no moral distinctions,⁶ a time when man was constitutionally unmoral. To St. Paul, the original state of Adam was one of purity, of innocence.⁷ Even now it is not the flesh in itself that

¹ Cp. Rom. v. 12. This view was already present in Jewish thought. Cp. Sir. xxv. 24.

² Cp. I Cor. xv. 21.

³ Job xv. 14 has been claimed as a reference to the Fall; but this is not justified. The Old Testament contains no doctrine of original sin. The same is true of Judaism. The rabbis, in explaining "visiting the iniquity . . . unto the third and fourth generation," affirm that the "hate Me" refers to the people of the third and fourth generations. They are punished for their own sin, not because of their fathers' sin. Cp. the absence of reference to Adam and Eve in the teaching of Jesus.

⁴ Cp. Ben Sirach, xxv. 23; Wisd. ii. 23-4; Enoch vi.-xi.; 4 Esd. vi. 46-8.

⁵ So Plutarch.

⁶ Cp. Kritias, *Sisyphus, a Satyric Drama*.

⁷ Cp. Plato, *Timæus*, 30 (God created human nature as beautiful and good as possible). For the different view of man's moral state at the beginning, held by modern palæontology, cp. Boule, *Les Hommes Fossiles*, p. 4.

is evil, but the passions which have their seat in the flesh.¹ The historic beginning of sin is found by St. Paul in Adam's fall, but the personal sin of each individual man is to be traced to the passions of his own flesh. At the same time, and in keeping with his view of Adam's rôle in the ethical history of mankind, St. Paul recognises that, alongside of what we may call the internal impetus to sinful conduct, there is also the external or demoniacal. Both traditions had a place in the thought of paganism apart from St. Paul. In the Old Testament, Satan attends the councils of the Most High. He is not regarded by Judaism as a power directly hostile to God, in the same malignant and antagonistic way that the Antichrist is opposed to all that God stands for in the universe. Bousset has shown that the Antichrist tradition is much earlier than St. Paul's day. Mithraism did a unique service by its comprehensive recognition of the perennial conflict going on everywhere between good and evil,² and by its vivid personification of evil.³ To St. Paul, the god of this age, who blinded human eyes and darkened human minds, was a tragic reality. He was "the prince of the power of the air,"⁴ alike to St. Paul and to contemporary paganism,⁵ exercising an evil influence upon human life on earth.

And yet, to St. Paul, human sin is to be traced immediately to the passions of the flesh. To St. Paul, the human body regarded simply as the creation of God is

¹ Cp. Of Piety and True Philosophy, § 17 ("All that in man is animal, is proner unto bad [than unto good]").

² "Les animaux et les plantes, comme les hommes, sont rangés dans deux camps adverses" (Cumont, *Les Religions orientales dans le paganisme romain*, p. 190).

³ Cp. Dedications to Ahriman and the infernal spirits (Cumont, *Les Mystères de Mithra*, p. 172 n. 3).

⁴ Cp. Eph. ii. 2. "It is therefore extremely probable that the Mithraists figured Ahriman as ruling the earth from the sphere immediately outside it"; cp. Legge, *Forerunners and Rivals of Christianity*, ii. p. 256.

"And they defended themselves, saying: This world of lawlessness and of unbelief is under Satan . . ."; cp. Addendum to Mark xvi. 14, in an ancient fourth or fifth century New Testament (Washington Codex, 1908-9).

⁵ Cp. Reitzenstein, *Poimandres*, S. 49 n.

not evil in itself. In this respect he shows himself in line with the thought of Judaism, which emphasised the unity of the entire man, regarding body and spirit as one,¹ and never looked upon the body as being in itself the principle of evil. To Judaism, the body was the creation of God and the instrument of the soul. It must therefore not be neglected, enfeebled, or treated with contempt. While St. Paul does not put the highest value on bodily exercise,² we may be certain that this also was his view.

At the same time, St. Paul went beyond the Old Testament conception of the flesh. For the Old Testament does not conceive of the flesh as the seat of passions leading man astray, nor does it derive human sinfulness from the flesh as the instrument of passion.³ Without abandoning the fundamental conception of Judaism that the flesh in itself is not evil, St. Paul finds that, inasmuch as the flesh and its passions are inseparable, it is to that source that not only sensuality, but all sin, the entire perverted relationship existing between unredeemed men and God, is to be traced back.

The passions in themselves are potential evil, and must inevitably break forth in active sin, as soon as the opportunity arises. Yet St. Paul never loses sight of the all-important fact that the body is in itself a divine creation, the God-designed organ of the soul, and that it is capable of becoming a temple of the Holy Spirit through Jesus Christ. It is indeed incapable of being

¹ In this respect Judaism differs from Plato and the Hindu philosophers, who make a clear division between the human spirit and the human body. Philo's view resembles St. Paul's, viz. the body is not bad in itself: the source of evil is the passions of the body as being flesh (σάρξ).

² Cp. 1 Tim. iv. 8. Cp. Col. ii. 23; 1 Tim. v. 23. It has to be remembered that the Christian Church opposed suicide, which was so common in the pagan world of St. Paul's day.

³ St. Paul's view approximates to the Hellenistic. Differentiation, particularly as regards moral concepts, is a mark of high development in the history of human life. It has been shown by Freud that in the sphere of the subconscious, e.g. in dreams, and by Abel that in the early stages of the oldest languages, "the present differentiation has proceeded from an original identity of opposite ideas"; cp. Ernest Jones, "Psycho-Analysis and Anthropology" *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* (1924), p. 48.

delivered from the curse of death ; but it can be the abode of the Spirit who is life.¹

From the very nature of the flesh as being passion-charged, St. Paul clearly recognised that man could never be saved by the Law. Instead of providing deliverance, the Law stirred up the passions in man to perpetrate actual sin. Only the power of the Holy Spirit of Christ Jesus could give men deliverance from the bondage of passion. Hence, in St. Paul, we find the clear antithesis between the life of the redeemed man and the life of those who were perishing, the life in the Holy Spirit and the life of the natural man still under the unbridled dominion of the passions of the flesh.² This is to be regarded as the essentially Christian element of St. Paul's conception.³

Where St. Paul agrees with the teaching of Judaism, and disagrees with much of the teaching of paganism, is in regarding the body in itself as not evil.⁴ The evil arose out of the passions of the flesh. St. Paul does not, like the Orphics, regard the body in itself as the grave of the soul. He cannot depreciate the body, seeing that it is a creation of God Himself. Agreeing with the teaching of Judaism as regards the nature of the body in itself, he passes beyond that teaching by definitely recognising the seat of the passions in the flesh, and, in this latter respect, he agrees closely with the teaching of the Hermetic literature.⁵ There is, however, a fundamental

¹ Cp. Rom. viii. 10.

² This antithesis in St. Paul's teaching is moral and spiritual. In the Fourth Gospel, it has become cosmic.

³ It is not forgotten that in Orphism, Pythagoreanism, and Plato, the conflict between the spirit and flesh in man is emphasised ; but that is a very different matter from the conflict between the Holy Spirit and the passions of the flesh as understood by St. Paul.

⁴ We could not imagine words like the following coming from the apostle : " The soul is God's work, but the nature of the body is different, and in this respect there is no difference between the bodies of bat, worm, frog, and man. The matter is the same, and the corruptible part is alike " ; cp. Celsus, iv. 52.

⁵ " For things subject to birth abound in passions, birth in itself being passible. But where there's passion, nowhere is there Good ; and where is Good, nowhere a single passion " ; cp. In God alone is Good, and Elsewhere Nowhere, § 2. " The belly-lust, the error that

difference between St. Paul's thought and that of the Mystery religions as regards the nature of the transformation wrought in the body. In the case of the latter, the change is quasi-magical; in the case of St. Paul, the change is moral and spiritual.¹ To St. Paul, Christ in us meant not the perfecting of the natural man of passion, but a new state of life implying the death of the natural man.

An important part of the problem of sin as due to the passions of the flesh was naturally connected with sex-morality. The Christian demand for chastity was one which was bound to meet with special opposition in the Gentile churches, and raised the whole question of the status of woman in the Christian Church. With his clear insight into the essential nature of Christianity, St. Paul could boldly affirm that in Christ Jesus there was neither male nor female, which just meant that, speaking in general terms, man and woman were equal religiously in the eyes of God. But there were prejudices and disabilities as regards the just treatment of women, derived from both pagan and Jewish sources, from which it must have been difficult for St. Paul to liberate his mind altogether. As the result of the way in which women were usually treated, their moral stamina suffered. We find a reflection of this in much of the classical writings.² Jewish law, as regards both marriage and divorce, was more favourable to men than to women.³ Only the husband had the right to divorce. All that the wife could do was to apply to the Jewish tribunal, which, if it saw fit to do so, might compel the husband to give a bill of divorcement. If the husband refused to obey the tribunal,

doth lead the band of all the other ills"; cp. In God alone is Good, and Elsewhere Nowhere, § 3. "Yet passion differeth from passibility; for that the one is active, while the other is passive"; cp. About the Common Mind of Hermes to Tat, § 11. For an interesting passage in regard to what happens at the dissolution of the body, cp. Poimandres, ch. i. §§ 24-6.

¹ Cp. 1 Cor. xv. 44; 2 Cor. iii. 18, iv. 16, v. 4, 5; Rom. viii. 23, 29, xii. 2; Phil. iii. 10, 21.

² e.g. "Who putteth his trust in a woman putteth his trust in a deceiver"; cp. Hesiod, *Works and Days*, p. 14 (Mair's translation).

³ Cp. Juster, *Les Juifs dans l'empire romain*, ii. pp. 42-4.

the Roman authority compelled him to do so. Under Roman law, husband and wife had equal rights as regards divorce.¹ In both respects, Roman law showed a fairer spirit in the treatment of women.

A man's attitude towards womankind is very largely determined by the experience of his early days. The disposition and character of one's mother influence our estimate of female disposition and character for all time to come. Now we know nothing of St. Paul's mother; but we do know that Tarsus was essentially an Oriental city, where respectable women were completely veiled as they walked along its streets,² and that veiling was a constant reminder to them of their inferior position. The respectable pagan women of the upper middle classes habitually went to the temple-worship veiled. St. Paul showed the influence of prejudice formed in his boyhood, by demanding that Christian women also should be veiled,³ and gives the quaint reason for making this demand that otherwise the beauty of the women might tempt the angels.⁴ This restriction must have been particularly hard on Christian women of the slave class and converted harlots, who had been accustomed in their pagan days to go without the veil.

Then a further illustration of St. Paul's general attitude towards women is given in his injunction that women should not speak in the churches,⁵ that they should ask their husbands in the quiet of their own home in regard to any point of difficulty, and, generally speaking, of their own free will as Christian women, show a spirit of becoming submission towards their own husbands.⁶

¹ Cp. Juster, *op. cit.* ii. pp. 57-8.

² Cp. Ramsay, *Pictures of the Apostolic Church*, p. 341; cp. Böhlig, *Die Geisteskultur von Tarsos*, S. III n. 2; cp. Dion of Prusa, *Tarsica*, § 48.

³ Cp. 1 Cor. xi. 10.

⁴ Or it may be the demons; cp. Dion of Prusa, *Or.* 33, 48 ff.

⁵ "Because keeping at home and silence are becoming to married women"; cp. Plutarch, *The Mysteries of Isis and Osiris*, lxxvi. 11.

⁶ Voluntary submission inspired by Christian principles thus took the place of the slavish legal relationship which was characteristic of the pagan married state.

St. Paul thus, while maintaining the religious equality between man and woman, that is their equality in Christ Jesus, nevertheless affirms an inequality on natural grounds, and on grounds of tradition and custom. While upholding the religious equality of man and woman in virtue of the common possession of the One Spirit, St. Paul asserts the subordination of woman on creational, purposive, historic, and practical grounds.¹ At the same time it has to be pointed out that this comparative subordination of woman is not felt to produce spiritual or moral disabilities in the realisation of a chaste Christian life. In the churches of St. Paul, with all their necessary restraints, women would feel the call of new and loftier ideals of life for womenkind, and learn something of the glory of Christian self-respect.

In the early Christian Church a great forward stride was taken in conferring upon women their just rights and privileges. But it must be borne in mind that for this there was much preparation, alike in Judaism² and in paganism. The Old Testament is not deficient in pictures of tender and true female character which was richly appreciated by their men-folk, and a very great deal was done for women's emancipation out of this thralldom by the Mystery religions and the guilds.³ In

¹ Cp. Gal. iii. 28 ; 1 Cor. vii. 14, xi. 2-15, xii. 12-13, xiv. 34 ; 2 Cor. iii. 15.

² For evidence "that a Jewish woman could hold property and transact business independently of her father," cp. No. 9, Deed relating to the reversion of the property in No. 8 (460 B.C.); cp. No. 22, cols. v. and vi.; cp. No. 13, Conveyance of a house (447 B.C.); cp. Cowley, *Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century B.C.*

³ Cp. Poland, *Geschichte des Griechischen Vereinswesens*, SS. 289 ff., 298. One is impressed by the high status of women even in Babylonia; cp. Jastrow, *Religion of Babylonia and Assyria*, p. 604. Babylonian priestesses were more prominent in the earlier than in the later period. They were exorcisers and wailers; cp. Jastrow, *Religion of Babylonia and Assyria*, pp. 659-60. In Babylonia, a wife might have private possessions, and buy and sell them without her husband's consent; cp. Delaporte, *Mesopotamia*, p. 76. Women, especially priestesses, were included among the elders; cp. Delaporte, *Mesopotamia*, p. 94. In contrast with this, Rostovtzeff, speaking of Greek women of the fifth century B.C., says: "Democracy banished women from the street to the house: the kitchen and the nursery and the gynæceum, a special part of the house reserved for women and children, now became their sphere"; cp. *A History of the Ancient World*, p. 287.

such a case of incest as that reported, and dealt with, in the Corinthian Church, where a Christian man had married his stepmother, support was given to St. Paul's line of procedure, alike by Jewish and Roman law. The Oriental cults were very sympathetic towards women.¹ Women were admitted to the priesthood of the Magna Mater. In the happy intercourse of the guild-life, women discovered the joys of true sisterhood, and could associate freely with men, not as tyrants, but as brothers.

The services rendered, by the Christian Church as a whole, and by the Pauline churches in particular, to the emancipation and moral and social uplift of womanhood, can hardly be reckoned. It does not in any way depreciate that service to recognise the preparatory work of a beneficent kind rendered alike by Judaism and by paganism.

If St. Paul clearly recognised that the source of sinful living is to be found in the passions inseparable from the flesh, the body, he equally well recognised that there was another part of human nature, the higher spiritual part, which was capable, at least with Divine aid, of rising out of the welter of sin into a calm and holy life. Without this spiritual part, there could have been no hope of redemption for man. The merit of St. Paul does not lie in the discovery of this higher nature of men ; but in the clear apprehension of the truth that even it could only be redeemed by the grace of God in Jesus Christ, our Lord.

While all really great literature is ultimately a literature of the soul, the discovery by man that he had a soul must needs antedate even the oldest literature. In early Greek thought, the psyche is that other self, which

¹Cp. Cumont, *Les Religions orientales dans le paganisme romain*, p. 55. One of the great weaknesses of Mithraism was its refusal to admit women as initiates. This fact largely accounts for its final overthrow by Christianity. " Parmi les centaines d'inscriptions qui nous sont parvenues, aucune ne mentionne ni une prêtresse, ni une initiée, ni même une donatrice " ; cp. Cumont, *Les Mystères de Mithra*, p. 184. Contrast with this the important part played by women in the festivals of Dionysus ; cp. Diodorus Siculus, iv. 1.

is revealed in dreams and ecstasy, which departs from the body at death, and continues to live on its own independent life. Even though Homer does not expressly mention a cult of souls, it is implied by what he tells us concerning Patroclus,¹ who evidently took part in the feast of the dead given in his honour. To Heraclitus, "psyche" and "fire" are interchangeable terms, and the individual soul of man lives only by the continual appropriation of the enveloping world-fire or world-soul.² To Plato, the soul is older than the body, alien to it, and purely spiritual in nature. After death, it enters into an intermediate state, where penance is done for the sins of the earthly life. Thereafter, it passes through a series of reincarnations, either going downwards along the road of further sin, till at last it becomes the soul of a brute, or mounting up the path of successive purifications of a spiritual nature, till at length it wins final deliverance from the round of reincarnations. To Plato, the chief end of man was the perfecting of his soul.³ Aristotle followed Plato in affirming that the spirit existed from all eternity, and, while entering temporarily into a body, did not actually fuse with it, and survived after physical death. On the other hand, he held that the human spirit is pure in itself, needing no process of purification. In Aristotle, there is neither a craving for salvation nor a longing for the freedom of the life beyond. The Stoics, while affirming that only the one all-world soul eternally survives, admitted a certain continued, though temporary, life of the individual soul. A common view was that the souls of men came from the stars.⁴

¹ Cp. Homer, *Iliad*, 23, 24.

² One is reminded of St. Paul's doctrine of God's grace and the Holy Spirit as essential to continued spiritual life in the Christian.

³ "For I have no business but to go about persuading you all, both young and old, to care less for your bodies and your wealth than for the perfection of your souls" (Plato, Socrates' speech in his own defence).

⁴ Cp. Cicero, *Dream of Scipio*: "And a soul has been supplied to them from those eternal fires which you call constellations and stars"; cp. Plutarch, according to whom, reason comes to us from the sun.

Very instructive are the symbolic representations of the soul. It is variously depicted as a bird,¹ a siren, a bee,² a serpent, a fish,³ an eidolon, a moth, a maid with butterfly wings.

The divinity in man is clearly affirmed by the Hermetic literature.⁴ The rational part of the soul is immortal.⁵ The soul is in itself incorporeal essence,⁶ and, even when in the body, does not lose its distinctive character. At the commencement of life on the earth, it has no special desire to unite with the body, and never loves it at any time.⁷ It has its own end in itself, and is an "eternal intellectual essence."⁸ "The great ill of the soul is godlessness."⁹ The Hermetic teaching thus clearly recognises the higher, divine, eternal nature of man, the realisation of which in godly living is man's true destiny in life.

How far St. Paul was influenced by pagan teaching in regard to man's higher spiritual nature it is difficult to determine. We are on surer ground when we turn to the Old Testament, where the reality of that nature is not only affirmed, but where it is clearly said that it comes from God Himself.¹⁰

¹ Probably derived from the ancient Egyptians. Cp. Waser, *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft*, Bd. xvii., 1913: "Über die äussere Erscheinung der Seele in den Vorstellungen der Völker, zumal der alten Griechen" (S. 340 ff.).

² In ancient Egypt.

³ Cp. the practice of eating fish at the feasts of the dead. Thereby it was believed the participants had communion with the dead; cp. Christ eating the broiled fish. The most probable explanation of the designation of Christ as the *ἰχθύς* is that it is due to the fact that He was regarded as the guide (fish) of the departed through the waters of the underworld.

⁴ "Man is not measured with the rest of lives of things upon the earth, but with the lives above in heaven, who are called gods"; cp. The Key of Thrice-Greatest Hermes, § 24 (Mead, ii. p. 157). "The subtlest part . . . of Mind (is) God"; cp. About the Common Mind of Hermes to Tat, § 14 (Mead ii. p. 207).

⁵ Cp. Of Piety and (True) Philosophy, § 8 (Mead, iii. p. 7).

⁶ Cp. Of Soul, i. § 1 (Mead iii. p. 63).

⁷ Cp. *ibid.* ii. § 3 (Mead iii. p. 67).

⁸ Cp. *ibid.* iv. § 1, vi. § 1 (Mead iii. pp. 75, 80).

⁹ Cp. About the Common Mind of Hermes to Tat, § 3 (Mead ii. p. 200).

¹⁰ Cp. Gen. ii. 7; Job xxxii. 8; Isa. lvii. 16. In Hebrew thought, the soul was regarded as follows: (1) It was either contained in the blood, or identified with the blood. (2) It was regarded as the source

Comparing St. Paul with Philo, we find at once resemblance and difference. Like St. Paul, he clearly recognises the two elements in man, body and soul, the latter of which is a fragment of the Divine. Further, he recognises in the soul two constituent parts—the vital principle, and the higher element, the “pneuma,” which is rational, and the impressed image of God’s reason. With St. Paul he is also in complete agreement in affirming that “all that is good in man is derived from God, and is realised through direct communion with Him.”¹

To St. Paul, the soul is the real inner self, has its true kinship with the divine law and not with the flesh, and has impressed upon it the unwritten law of God. At the same time, being united to a fleshly body ruled by the passions, the soul is incapable of self-deliverance. Redemption must come from outside, from God Himself. In the process of human history, the psychical must, according to St. Paul, precede the spiritual. This order of events was decreed altogether apart from the entrance of sin into human history.² To St. Paul, there is no necessary antithesis between soul and spirit in man, nor is soul necessarily inferior to spirit. Spirit is rather, to St. Paul, soul as endowed with a spiritual dynamic.

In his conception of soul or spirit, St. Paul was, as in

of desire and feeling; to a certain extent, also, as the seat of memory, thought, and personal conscious life, and as personality itself, as understood in the limited sense of the Hebrews. (3) The soul finally abandons the body, when corruption takes place. (4) As to the survival of the soul in some sense, there were two traditions. According to one (the older), the soul, after physical death, retained a certain consciousness. According to the other tradition (the later), there is no real life in Sheol. When the spirit is withdrawn at physical death, the soul is annihilated, Sheol becomes Abaddon (destruction). Personality is destroyed at death. Even when the spirit is said to return to God, the spirit is conceived of as impersonal. Under this later view, there is thus no personal immortality, because the soul is the personal part in man, and perishes at death. The earlier of these above views is to be explained by the primitive Hebrew worship of ancestors. The later view is to be explained by the monotheism of Genesis. Yahwism destroyed the earlier view, by substituting consciousness of immediate communion with God for consciousness in Sheol; cp. Charles, *Eschatology*, pp. 39 ff.

¹ Cp. Kennedy, *Philo's Contribution to Christianity*, pp. 142 ff.

² Cp. 1 Cor. xv. 45 ff.

many other respects, a debtor both to Jew and Gentile. He held that the soul, the spirit, in man was his higher nature, a divine endowment, without which human salvation would have been impossible, yet incapable of saving itself from the thralldom of fleshly passions and sins, but capable of being completely saved by the grace of God and the working of the Holy Spirit of Jesus Christ, the Risen Lord.

In the long quest for salvation, for deliverance, two ways have appealed to the human mind—the way of external divine help freely given and usually associated with some rite of initiation, and the way of personal effort, of self-control, self-mastery, self-mortification, and asceticism. For the full realisation of each, there had been long preparation in the world into which St. Paul was born. Both found a place in his teaching, though the former is foundational and absolutely necessary, the latter more of the nature of a sequence or corollary.

It stands to the account of Chaldean astrology that it produced the belief in an irresistible and ruthless Fate,¹ which determines the destiny of all men and things. This belief spread far and wide, and laid its octopus grip upon the human mind. To counteract this oppressive rule of Fate, magic was invented. Magic and astrology spring from one common source. Magic presupposes that every living thing is associated with some material body, so that to destroy the one means to annihilate the other. Magic is a kind of spurious experimental science. Magic implies that in Nature there is law and order, and

¹ "Moira" means "lot," or "portion," and indicates the peculiar sphere of action and authority belonging to each particular god. Cp. Homer, *Iliad*, xv. 185; Cornford, *Greek Religious Thought*, p. xvii. The conception of Fate in Homer is not consistent. Sometimes Fate is regarded as superior to the Olympian gods, and sometimes as inferior to them. Sometimes Fate is indefinitely associated with Zeus. "But all men are subject to Fate, and genesis, and change, for these are the beginning and the end of Fate"; cp. About the Common Mind of Hermes to Tat, § 7. But even Fate is subject to the Mind, the Soul of God; cp. *op. cit.* § 9. "Reason (comes) under Providence; unreason (falls) under Necessity; the things that happen in the corporal (fall) under Fate"; cp. Concerning the Rule of Providence, Necessity, and Fate, § 3.

that the same causes produce the same results. Like astrology, magic is religious in its origin.

Whatever the means employed to secure deliverance from Fate, the desire for this deliverance was marked in all classes, in the higher as well as among the poor down-trodden slave class.¹ The state of peace in the world in the apostolic age encouraged this feeling, as it helped the spread of Christianity. Æsculapius² and other gods fulfilled the rôle of "God the Saviour."³

Deliverance, salvation, was sought after in several ways, both outside man and within him. Greek philosophy knows nothing of a salvation which comes from outside or above man himself.⁴ It is a different matter with the Mystery religions.⁵ The initiate of the Isis-cult is freed from the tyranny of Fate by his initiation, lives already on the other side, and, even when guilty of bodily sin, only appears to commit sin. This is a typical example of the belief held by the devotees of the Mystery cults. The Gnostics, while their primary interest was cosmological, agreed with St. Paul in their pessimistic attitude towards "the flesh," and indeed towards the whole created world as it actually is now, and in the importance which they attached to redemption.⁶

To understand St. Paul's theory of salvation, we must

¹ "Redemption from this servitude, which embittered daily existence, was probably the object of intensest craving in the higher life of pagan society"; cp. Kennedy, *St. Paul and the Mystery Religions*, p. 25.

² Θεὸς Σωτήρ, "deus clinicus"; cp. Christ, the Saviour, as "the Good Physician." Bousset points out that there was a pre-Christian "Gnosis," and that supernaturalism was bound up with a theory of redemption; cp. *Kyrios Christos*, S. 141.

³ There were the Σωτηριασταί among the guilds; cp. Poland, *Geschichte des Griechischen Vereinswesens*, S. 63; cp. Osiris and Hermes as βασιλεὺς Σωτήρ; cp. Augustus as royal Σωτήρ. We have to think of the Cæsar as trying to get rid of the tyranny of Fate, to which he was as much subordinate as his humblest subject, by swallowing the imperial fiction of persuading himself that he was divine.

⁴ Orphism "laid stress solely on the salvation of the individual soul through purity and asceticism"; cp. Farnell, *Greek Hero Cults and Ideas of Immortality*, p. 385.

⁵ The Redeemer-Lord "was the centre of almost every Mystery religion"; cp. Lake, *The Stewardship of Faith*, p. 97.

⁶ Cp. Bousset, *Kyrios Christos*, S. 236. In Poimandres, deliverance is effected through γνῶσις; in St. Paul, through Jesus Christ.

bear in mind that even matter in itself is not inherently evil, that man to begin with has been made in the image of God,¹ and that St. Paul's mind is primarily not speculative, but practical. To him, the body, all the same, has no part in the operation through which salvation is obtained. Even the mind cannot rule the passions of the flesh. To St. Paul, it is Jesus Christ, specially as the Crucified and Risen Lord, who is the source of redemption.² Christ, His Gospel, and His Cross are revelations of that God who is love. It is purely due to the free gift of God that we are willing to accept Christ's salvation. It is also through God's free gift that this salvation becomes a living force in the Christian. The man who is in the state of grace, which is entirely God's gift, is a redeemed man. As such he is a son of God, justified, living a life which is in vivid contrast to his former unredeemed life, and certain to be saved in the day of judgment. While it is in the Church that salvation is secured, it is not through the Church as such, but through Jesus Christ.

¹ In the old Egyptian view, even the body was made in the image of God. "Es wird altägyptischer Vorstellung entsprechen, wenn in den Zauberpapyri behauptet wird, dass selbst der Leib des Menschen, in den der Gott eintritt, diesem ähnlich wird"; cp. Reitzenstein, *Poimandres*, S. 236; cp. Gen. i. 26. Some think that the "image" here refers to man's "dominion" over other living creatures; cp. Holzinger, *Genesis, H.C.*, S. 12. Better, with Driver (*The Book of Genesis*, p. 15), to understand "the gift of self-conscious reason."

² It is interesting to compare the teaching of Jesus and that of St. Paul, in regard to the theory of salvation. (1) To Jesus, God is our Father, who is always showing His love; to St. Paul, the love of God is supremely and uniquely manifested in the Cross of Jesus. (2) To Jesus, at first, the kingdom of God is at hand; for it His followers are to prepare. To St. Paul, from the first, the kingdom of God is already come in the resurrection of Jesus. (3) Jesus, by His life, teaching, and example, reveals the way by which men can realise their life as God's children. St. Paul certainly regards Jesus' human life as our best example to imitate; but it is through the power of His Cross, Resurrection, and Spirit, that men, by faith in Him and fellowship with Him, realise their sonship.

There is much to be said for Bousset's distinction between the religion of Jesus and the religion of St. Paul. "Will man scharf formulieren, so könnte man sagen, dass das Evangelium Jesu die (ethische) Religion der Sündenvergebung darstellt, während erst Paulus das Christentum zu einer "Erlösungs" Religion im supranaturalen Sinn ausgestaltet"; cp. *Kyrios Christos*, S. 136.

Altogether, while the long-felt yearning for deliverance, and the various attempts to find it, whether from internal or external sources, undoubtedly prepared the way for the Pauline conception of salvation, this latter is in its essential nature as different from what preceded it as it is infinitely richer and more efficient.

In view of what has been said in regard to St. Paul's theory of salvation, it has to be noted that, while St. Paul was an advocate of a certain measure of asceticism, he does not regard it as an efficient means of deliverance from the tyranny of fleshly passions. Asceticism, in St. Paul's scheme, was not set forth as in itself a sufficient means of moral deliverance. At the same time there is a distinctive ascetic note in the teaching of St. Paul, and it is not to the Greek environment that we must turn to discover the genesis of this ascetic ideal. On the whole, asceticism is alien to the Greek mind, though there were exceptions.¹ In like manner, the Romans were averse to extreme ascetic practices. While they gratefully acknowledged the signal service rendered by the Greek goddess Cybele at a crisis in the Punic wars, they nevertheless abhorred such practices as the emasculation of her Oriental devotees. It was forbidden to Roman citizens to emasculate themselves, or to become priests of the great goddess.

But there is abundant precedent for the practice of asceticism elsewhere. We hear, for example, of a devotee of Isis, who, on a cold winter morning, broke the ice to plunge thrice into the Tiber, and, afterwards, crawled on bleeding knees over the Campus Martius.² In the Eleusinian Mysteries, there was a period of fasting imposed previous to initiation. Certain foods were totally

¹ For an argument against the use of purificatory rites, sacrifice, magic, and ascetic practices, as means of curing diseases, cp. Hippocrates, *On the Sacred Disease* (epilepsy).

² Cp. Juvenal, vi. 528; cp. Seneca, *Vit. beat.* xxvii. 8. For asceticism and monasticism in Egypt, cp. Scott-Moncrieff, *Paganism and Christianity in Egypt*, pp. 198 ff.

prohibited on the ground that they caused impurity. This last practice was almost certainly derived from Egypt.¹

When we turn away from Egypt to the East, we find abundant evidence of a strongly ascetic tendency. Mazdeism was, more than any other religion, inspired by a cathartic ideal. Before participating in the Mithraic communion, strict ascetic practices had to be observed. The devotee must purify himself by repeated ablutions and flagellations. Lustrations and ablutions were believed to purify the soul from defilement. The Mithraist sternly resisted sensuality, and practised abstinence to an excessive degree.

There is a possibility that St. Paul was influenced by these practices. His was a nature to which they would directly appeal. To realise one's true character, to carry through effectively one's mission in life, the body must be brought, and kept, under subjection.

While there was an element of asceticism in Judaism, it was moderate. The Jews did not permit a eunuch priesthood.²

When we take into account the current conception of the act of generation as something demoniacal,³ it cannot be said that St. Paul's asceticism, as regards the relation of the sexes, was extreme. While St. Paul was an ascetic as regards marriage and the sex relationship, he did not uphold an ascetic ideal as regards many good things of this life. These latter he regarded as God's kind gifts to men, meant to be enjoyed. His strictness in regard to sexual purity is largely to be explained by abhorrence for pagan sex excesses.⁴ The contention of paganism was that fornication, particularly for men, was as much a necessity of the body as food and drink, and morally a

¹ Cp. Foucart, *Les Mystères d'Éleusis*, pp. 284 ff. "Ten days [contented] with food wherein life had never been"; cp. *The Golden Ass*, xi. 28.

² Cp. Farnell, *Greece and Babylon*, p. 256.

³ Cp. Dobschütz, *Christian Life in the Primitive Church*, p. 40.

⁴ These had driven many others—Cynics, Stoics, Essenes, Therapeutæ—to asceticism as regards sex.

thing indifferent.¹ To St. Paul, this view was altogether incompatible with life in Christ. Whether married or single, the Christian must be chaste. It is practically certain that he himself was unmarried, and held a decided belief in the superior purity of the unmarried state. Celibacy, maintained for religious reasons, seemed to him a higher ideal of life than even Christian marriage. His view that marriage was a concession to human weakness does not commend itself to the highest type of modern Christian. The form of celibacy frequently met with in modern times, and due to selfishness, indolence, and the cowardly shirking of responsibility, is altogether abhorrent to the Christian conscience. Real Christian marriage, which recognises the providence of God as the power bringing together a man and woman in one unified life, inspired by the ideal of Christian service to God and men, and marked by unblemished fidelity to the marriage vows, is the highest of all states.

It has to be remembered that St. Paul was living under peculiar conditions. There was not only the necessity to set up a strict opposition to the prevailing low ideals of sex-relationships in contemporary paganism, but the conviction that, in the full realisation of the kingdom of God, there could be no distinction between male and female, carried weight; and, in addition to this, there was the vivid belief that the Second Coming was so close at hand that marriage was undesirable and even meaningless.

One thing that St. Paul was adamant in regard to was that, when marriage was once entered upon, it must not be broken "lightly nor unadvisedly." The Christian man or woman must not even divorce the pagan partner, unless the latter desired it, and, even in the case where

¹ In the religion of Aphrodite, sex immorality, so far from being regarded as immoral, had a definite religious value. One of the difficulties which St. Paul had to face was that he had to combat the view that a man could retain his old pagan sex-habits, and be Christian as regards things spiritual; cp. 1 Cor. v. 1-13, vi. 12-20, x. 8. In the Corinthian Church, there was, side by side, an inclination to retain the old pagan sex-morality, and a desire to abolish marriage altogether.

divorce was resorted to, the Christian must not marry again.¹

That St. Paul attached a high value to Christian marriage, basing it on Christ Himself, cannot be denied. To him, it had a distinct ethical worth and a real religious and mystical basis.² Just because he sensibly recognised, along with this, the natural foundation of marriage, St. Paul could not give countenance to the so-called "spiritual marriage," which was practised in the colonies of the Therapeutæ, and, afterwards, in the Christian Church of the second and third centuries.

Altogether, the asceticism of St. Paul, if, in some aspects, it is no longer attractive to the modern Christian mind, is to be explained in that respect by the peculiar circumstances and beliefs of his age. On the whole, it was lofty in its conception, upheld a high ideal, not only of marriage, but of the entire relationship of the sexes, and contains a safe residue of practical guidance for the Christian Church of all time.

A richer, and more certain, way of realising deliverance was through ecstasy. Every one possessed of the Holy Spirit was a pneumatic, and ecstasy was simply an intensified form of the pneumatic state. The phenomenon was known to paganism long before St. Paul's day. The essential difference between St. Paul's ecstasy and that of the pagan world lay in the fact that, whereas pagan ecstasy was due to the influence of one of their gods, the ecstasy of St. Paul was due to the direct possession of the Holy Spirit in a special degree.

The idea that the soul could separate from the body, and, in that condition, see visions, had its place in Greek religious thought.³ The Neo-Pythagoreans taught that

¹ St. Paul did not forbid remarriage, but he evidently regarded it as undesirable; cp. 1 Cor. vii. 39 ff.

² Cp. Eph. v. 22 ff. "All that is ethical in Christian marriage is conditioned by the natural; all that is natural ought to be wholly and fully stamped with the ethical"; "The indestructible foundation of an ideal marriage is faith in God"; cp. Haering, *Ethics of the Christian Life*, pp. 324, 326.

³ Cp. Clemen, *Primitive Christianity*, p. 69.

man, in a state of ecstasy, could receive direct revelations from God. In the Dionysiac religion, the worshippers who took part in the orgiastic ritual, and, in so doing, were carried away in a delirious frenzy, believed themselves thereby to be in complete union with their god, and so sharers in his immortality. In the system of Posidonius, which was a form of astral mysticism, there is described the ecstasy with which he left the earth and was transported into the midst of the sacred chorus of the stars.¹ The association of the ecstatic state with the possession of a "pneuma" (a spirit) was common to paganism and the Christianity² of St. Paul. Where St. Paul differed from paganism was in his "pneuma" being the Holy Spirit, the Spirit that is the Risen Lord, and in his assertion that every Christian, whether in the ecstatic state or not, was habitually possessed of that Spirit. Prophecy, glossalia,³ and visions were characteristic features of the ecstatic state.

But it was not merely in paganism that St. Paul could find precedent for the ecstatic state. It was a feature of the life of his own people. There was both prophecy and vision in the seers of the Old Testament. The prophet's utterances were not only actually, but verbally, the direct message of God.⁴ In the Jewish apocalyptic literature, the ecstatic state is ascribed to the direct influence of the

¹ Cp. Cumont, *After Life in Roman Paganism*, pp. 27 ff. Cicero was the most distinguished pupil of Posidonius. For parallels to St. Paul's "out of the body" (2 Cor. xii. 2) and ascending to the "third heaven," cp. Rohde, *Psyche*, ii. SS. 92 ff.; cp. Mead, *Thrice-Greatest Hermes*, i. p. 101 (Nechepso, in ecstasy, "left his body, and heard a heavenly voice addressing him"); cp. Reitzenstein, *Poimandres* (Krates), S. 361. The ecstatic elements in Gnosticism and in the Hermetic literature find their parallels in St. Paul; cp. Bousset, *Kyrios Christos*, S. 230.

² Cp. the magical papyri.

³ When the language of the inspired person could be understood, it was prophecy; when it was incomprehensible, it was merely glossalia. The glossalia were not peculiar to Christians. They belonged to the ecstasy which was characteristic of certain forms of pagan religious life; cp. Reitzenstein, *Poimandres*, SS. 57-8; cp. Wetter, "Das älteste hellenistische Christentum nach der Apostelgeschichte" (*Archiv für Religionswissenschaft*, Bd. xxi. Hefte 3-4), S. 402.

⁴ Cp. *Odes of Solomon*, 6.

Spirit. There were prophets still among the Jews in the days of the rise of Christianity.¹ The rabbis seem to have discouraged ecstatic experiences.² Still, it has to be remembered that not only were there great rabbis who enjoyed communion with the Holy Spirit, but there is a mystical element in the rabbinical conception of the Shechinah, and the Scriptures were regarded by the rabbis as inspired by the Holy Spirit.

There is a striking similarity between St. Paul's conception of the ecstatic state and that of Philo,³ who himself experienced mystic ecstasy.⁴ Like St. Paul, Philo was probably more influenced by the prophetic vision of the Old Testament than by Hellenism, and, like St. Paul also, he regards ecstasy as involving the complete possession of human personality by the Holy Spirit. To him, vision of God can only be secured by forsaking things material, even the body itself.

At the very foundation of St. Paul's whole system there is a religious outlook which may, speaking in general terms, be called ecstatic. To be a Christian meant to him possession by the Holy Spirit, and that implied a state of feelings which was in large measure ecstatic. Still, even for the Christian, there were degrees of possession by the Holy Spirit, and ecstasy, properly so called, was where a very special intensity of the possession by the Holy Spirit filled a man's heart. St. Paul, in this matter as in others, exhibited a broad-minded attitude. He readily admitted that pagans as well as Christians had experience of the ecstatic state, and evidently objects to excesses in both.⁵ What was of vital importance was the spirit by which the ecstatic state was produced in either

¹ Cp. Luke ii. 36; Acts xi. 27.

² "He who reads the secret books [*i.e.* the apocalypses] has no portion in the world to come"; cp. Sanhedrin.

³ Cp. his *ὁρατικοί*, "men of vision" (*de plantatione*, 36).

⁴ Cp. *quis rev. div. hæv.* 69; *de migratione Abrah.* 35. Philo distinguishes four kinds of ecstasy: (1) a mad frenzy; (2) an intense stupor; (3) quiescence of the understanding; (4) (the highest) that divine possession and frenzy characteristic of the prophet (cp. Kennedy, *Philo's Contribution to Christianity*, pp. 228-9).

⁵ Cp. 1 Cor. xii. 2, xiv. 23.

case. The gift of "discernings of spirits"¹ was a most precious possession. What differentiated Christian ecstasy from all other was that it was directly due to the possession of the Holy Spirit, the Spirit of the Risen Lord.

All the characteristic phenomena of the ecstatic state are found in the writings of St. Paul—prophecy, the gift of tongues, celestial visions, separation from the body itself, and exaltation to the third heaven. His conversion, the commencement of his new life as a Christian, had, as its most important feature, his vision of the Lord.² The genesis of St. Paul's ecstatic experience of exaltation to the "third heaven" is probably to be found in the astral religion, according to which the soul, in one journey, first reaches the moon, by a second journey, the sun, and by a third, the highest vault of heaven.

Altogether, in St. Paul's conception of ecstasy we have to recognise moulding influences both Jewish and pagan. But what gives it its most characteristic and most precious value is this, that the source of the Pauline ecstasy is the direct possession of the Holy Spirit, the Spirit of Jesus Christ, the Risen Lord. Ecstasy in itself is not a source of salvation. That is secured through faith in Christ crucified, and in the possession of His Spirit. But ecstasy is one of the inevitable results of being a Christian and receiving in special measure the gift of that Holy Spirit. The ecstatic state is to be regarded as being in a unique degree a condition of deliverance from the bondage of fleshly passions, and, indeed, from the hampering restraints of everything that is material.

¹ Cp. 1 Cor. xii. 10.

² Cp. 1 Cor. ix. 1, xv. 8. Kennedy thinks that the combination of *γινῶναι* and *συμμορφιζόμενος* in Phil. iii. 10 would "indicate a background for the Apostle's conception akin to the Mystery-doctrine of transformation by the vision of God"; cp. *St. Paul and the Mystery Religions*, p. 282.

CHAPTER VII

THE SACRAMENTAL

ALTHOUGH it is a matter in regard to which unanimity among theologians is not likely to be secured, the balance of opinion is probably in favour of the view that it was St. Paul who did more than any other of the Early Church leaders to introduce the sacramental element into Christianity.¹ That sacramental element was already present in paganism. St. Paul could hardly fail to be influenced by it. The pagan conceptions of the death and resurrection of a god, with the corresponding rites, the rapture in the heart of the devotee, and the sense of communion with deity, must have been well known to him. The pagan belief that the initiate, by his initiation, died to his mortal life, and was reborn a child of eternity, must have strongly appealed to a mind like St. Paul's, and perhaps exercised a moulding influence on St. Paul's view alike of Christian baptism and the Lord's Supper.

It may not be possible to show with precision how far the Christian sacraments were influenced in their character by the pagan precedents of initiation and the sacramental banquet; but there can be no doubt that these latter have in several respects a striking similarity to the Christian sacraments,² and sought to serve a similar

¹ Cp. Clemen, *Primitive Christianity*, p. 246.

² The very fact that the Church Fathers wrongly regarded the pagan sacraments as blasphemous caricatures of the Christian rites is evidence that they recognised features common to both; cp. Justin Martyr, *First Apology*, c. lxvi.: "Wherefore also the evil demons in mimicry have handed down that the same thing should be done in the Mysteries of Mithras. For that bread and a cup of water are in these Mysteries set before the initiated with certain speeches, you either know or can learn."

purpose in the religious life of paganism. There is no need to deny either the original elements in the Christian sacraments, nor their sublime nature; but, equally, there is no need to ignore the pagan precedents which prepared the way for the former.

The rite of initiation has a suggestive resemblance to Christian baptism. We find it alike in the Egyptian, Greek, and Persian religions.

The initiated in the Mysteries of Isis were carefully instructed. The candidates had to await the call of the goddess, staying in the temple precincts, and constantly engaged in prayer and fasting.¹ It was a serious matter, even financially. There was a considerable amount of expense involved.²

The formal initiation began with lustration with water,³ a kind of baptism at the hands of a priest. Strict abstention from animal food, wine, and women was required of the initiate. He was clothed in white garments, exhibited to the congregation, and received gifts from them. Secret ceremonies were then performed before the initiate. Again, after the night of initiation, he was shown to the congregation in his Olympian garment, and, after donning a succession of robes, he provided a banquet to celebrate his natal day. This concluded the first stage of initiation. Twelve months later, and after a period of preparation extending over ten days, he proceeded to the second stage of initiation into the mysteries of the great god and highest progenitor of the gods, the unconquered Osiris.⁴ Not

¹ Cp. Apuleius, *Metamorph.* bk. xi. c. 21.

² *Ibid.* bk. xi. c. 28.

³ There is a wall-painting of Herculaneum which depicts the adoration of the holy water. In this scene, the priest, standing in the middle in the portico of the temple above the steps, holds in front of him, in the folds of his robe, a vessel containing the holy water, which is supposed to have come from the Nile. Cp. the ancient religious custom of the Japanese (the *misogi*), of lustration by bathing in cold water; cp. Katsuro Hara, *An Introduction to the History of Japan*, p. 43. Two skulls found in the cella of the temple of Isis at Pompeii are believed to have been used at the ceremony of initiation.

⁴ Cp. Apuleius, *Metamorph.* bk. xi. c. 27. These latter of Osiris "were far different" from those of Isis.

long after, and again succeeding ten days of preparation, he underwent the third initiation.¹ The initiates of Isis were comforted with the promise of a happy future in the realms of Osiris.

Orphism had its rites of initiation, which to some extent suggest Christian baptism. But it is surely going too far when Eisler would find "an immediate connection between the Dionysian or Orphic initiation-rites and the whole baptismal symbolism of the earliest Christian Church."² He attaches great importance to the idea that, through baptism, Christians became "fishes,"³ and "put on Christ," just as the pagan priests put on fish-skins. There was a religious or sacred use of the fish in several lands widely apart—in Egypt, Babylonia, Britain, Palestine.⁴ Too much must not be made of the fish argument. The true precedent for Christian baptism is the Jewish rite, and, in any case, Christian baptism has a distinctive character of its own, just because it is the baptism of Christ.

Initiation played a very important part in the Eleusinian Mysteries. The fact that initiation was determined by the initiate's own free choice marks a great advance beyond the stage where a man's religion was simply determined for him by the tribe to which he belonged. It is probable that there was no fixed age

¹ Cp. Apuleius, *Metamorph.* bk. xi. c. 30.

² Cp. *Orpheus, the Fisher*, p. 69.

³ Cp. Eisler, *Orpheus, the Fisher*, pp. 73-4; cp. Christians as "pisciculi" i.e. "little fishes," Tert. *de bapt.* c. 1; cp. "fishes which pass through the paths of the sea," Paulinus of Nola, *Epist.* xx.

⁴ In Babylonia, the fish was the symbol of Ea, the god of the deep. One of the priests, officiating at the purificatory rites at the burial of the dead, was clad in a fish costume; cp. Jastrow, *Religion of Babylonia and Assyria*, p. 602. For Britain, cp. Dio Cassius, *Epp.* xxvi. 12. Scheftelowitz has shown, from the Rabbinic literature, that the fish in the waters was a common symbol of the faithful Israelite as early as the time of Gamaliel; cp. *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft*, Bd. xiv. SS. 321 ff. (1911). Eisler would identify the ritual fish-and-bread banquet, which appears on the catacombs, with the Agapæ or Love-feasts; cp. *Orpheus, the Fisher*, p. 217; cp. the abundant use of the *ἰχθῦς* for Christ; cp. the tradition, reaching back to early Babylonian times, that, at the Flood, the fishes did not die; cp. the fish and ear of corn (symbol of the resurrection) on coins (*Eisler, Orpheus, the Fisher*, plate xxvii.; cp. plate lii).

for initiation ; but the Athenian practice was to have it either in infancy or when adolescence was reached.¹ The first initiation was sufficient to guarantee salvation, but the subsequent degrees made it more certain. There were altogether three stages of initiation : (1) the Little Mysteries, where the history of Dionysus (*i.e.* Zagreus) was shown ; (2) the Great Mysteries, including the rape of Persephone and the wanderings of Demeter ;² (3) the Epopsy, which was open to initiates of the second year, and showed the marriage of Zeus and Demeter, and the birth of the new Zagreus. It is specially noteworthy that the initiates bathed in the sea-water at Phalerum to wash away their sin,³ and took part in a severe trial of their courage, wandering through gloomy passages, and overcoming serious obstacles, before they finally emerged into the open air in a blaze of light. The purpose of this latter ceremony was to show them the miseries of the uninitiated dead, and it may be compared with the baptism for the dead mentioned by St. Paul.⁴

The initiates of Mithraism underwent a baptism by total immersion, which was believed to wash away sins.⁵ There is a striking similarity, alike as regards the method and results in Christian baptism. The months of March and April were preferred for Mithraic initiations. We remember the customary admission of Christian catechumens to baptism about the same time. Mithraism had a baptism of the blood of the bull, and also a baptism

¹ Cp. Foucart, *Les Mystères d'Éleusis*, p. 274. "The initiates of the altar" (Μνηθέντες ἀφ' ἐστίας) were always infants ; cp. Foucart, *op. cit.* pp. 277 ff.

² To the initiates of the Eleusinian Mysteries, Demeter was a real goddess, and was firmly believed to be such to the end ; cp. Foucart, *Les Mystères d'Éleusis*, pp. 259-60.

³ A second purification took place when the initiates were reunited for the Great Mysteries in the Eleusinium at Athens. The initiates were conducted to the sea, bathed in the salt water, and so rendered pure ; cp. ἀλαθε μύσται, "initiates to the sea."

⁴ Cp. 1 Cor. xv. 29 ; cp. Plato, *Republic*, ii. 364. Weinel holds that vicarious baptism for the dead was baptism for those who had died before conversion ; cp. *St. Paul*, p. 120.

⁵ Cp. Porph. *de antro nymph.*, c. 15 ; cp. Tert. *de præscriptionibus adversus hereticos*, 40.

of pure water. Christianity also had its twofold baptism, baptism with water and with the Holy Spirit. But there can be no connection between the blood of the bull and the latter.

It was characteristic of the Mystery religions that, in their conception of initiation, as in other respects, they developed from a cruder to a more spiritual ideal and practice. Through initiation, they offered salvation. This salvation was secured by a process of regeneration, and conferred deliverance from the tyranny of the otherwise omnipotent Fate, and specially from the crowning manifestation of that tyranny in death, by giving to the initiated the assurance of personal immortality. The transformation involved was a transformation of essence, mainly physical, but partly also psychical. Initiation involved communion with the deity, and eventually led to deification.

St. Paul also proclaimed personal salvation ; but it was secured through a Person, the Risen and Exalted Christ, the Son of God ; through Christ dwelling in the redeemed human heart. Baptism is, of course, a kind of initiation, implying possession of the Holy Spirit, that is, the Risen Christ. But the emphasis is on the personal Risen Christ, not on the rite *per se*. Regeneration is also part of St. Paul's scheme ; but it is secured by the Spirit of Christ taking possession of the personality of the individual Christian. Fate, to St. Paul, is ultimately God's purpose and providence. What he demands is a right understanding of this. He does not deny the reality of the "stoicheia," nor the necessity to be delivered from these ; but he recognises that the ultimate power must be in the hands of God. He insists on the truth that all that God does for men, and particularly for Christians, is essentially good and kind.

Death, to St. Paul, is the servant of God, fulfilling His purpose. To those who are in fellowship with Him through Christ death can have no terrors. How could it have, when it is subject to God's will ? It is simply a

stage on the progressive Christian march to full liberty and complete realisation of the life in God. To St. Paul, immortality is not merely a future experience, but a certainty of the present existence, already in part realised.

The redeemed life, to St. Paul, does imply a certain real change in the body, in the flesh as well as in the soul, in the physical as well as in the psychical and pneumatic parts, in the sense that all these become sanctified by the indwelling Spirit of Christ. The new character of the tenant of the temple of the body gives a new character to the temple itself. But, at the same time, to St. Paul, the real and most important changes are moral and spiritual. It is in the moral and spiritual parts of a converted man, that the Spirit most directly and effectually operates. In keeping with this, the end of the process to St. Paul is not deification, not personal identification with the Deity, but the glory of sanctification.

In the Hermetic literature, we find much that is at least suggestive of the intimate association of the Holy Spirit with Christian baptism.¹

Again we have to recognise frankly that there was a purely Jewish stream of influence operating on St. Paul's mind as regards rites of initiation. There was, moreover, a variety of precedent as to the value, and even absolute necessity, of those rites. The Ger Zedek,² the full proselyte, the proselyte of righteousness, had to undergo both the baptismal bath and the rite of circumcision. Many rabbis held that circumcision secured for the Jew a place in "Abraham's bosom," while the uncircumcised

¹ Cp. Reitzenstein, *Poimandres*: "Auch in unserem Stück ist das Mysterium der Wiedergeburt zugleich das der Propheten-weihe" (S. 220).

² These have to be carefully distinguished from the people designated as "proselytes of the gate," which is a purely medieval term, and the "God-fearing." The "God-fearing" were not proselytes in the strict sense at all. They were simply a group of people who were loosely attached to the Jewish Church, monotheists, who attended the worship of the synagogue, and adopted the observance of the Sabbath and the food law, without accepting the whole of the ceremonial law.

assuredly went down to Gehenna. This is in line with the pagan teaching in regard to their rites of initiation. Paganism, however, disagreed with a number of passages in the Talmud, where it is stated that even circumcision is not sufficient to save a sinner from Gehenna. Paganism, likewise, differed radically from Judaism, because in the latter there is neither the conception of absorption in, nor identification with, Deity, through mystic initiation. In this respect, St. Paul agrees with Judaism and not with pagan belief, and it marks a very far-reaching difference between St. Paul's and the pagan view.

At the same time we have to note that the mystical sacramental element in St. Paul's conception of baptism is akin to pagan mysticism.¹ There is, further, in common to St. Paul and the pagan belief, the sense of the presence of Deity, and the promised ultimate reward of personal immortality given to the initiate. There is a suggestion of the spiritual body of St. Paul in the sacred "form" ² acquired by the initiate.

But, in several vital respects, there is a gulf of separation between pagan rites of initiation and the Pauline baptism. There is nothing in the pagan rite corresponding to the direct personal touch implied in baptism "into

¹ "Alles in allem genommen, kann nicht geleugnet werden, dass die mystischsacramentale Ausdeutung der Taufe bei Paulus vorhanden ist"; cp. Weiss, *Das Urchristentum*, S. 501. Weiss, however, rightly points out that, along with the mystic-sacramental element, we must recognise in St. Paul and in all Christian teaching from the first, the emphasis laid on the ethical, viz. repentance.

We have the mystical association by St. Paul of Christ's death with baptism, although it is noteworthy that the bulk of St. Paul's references to death with Christ have no connection with baptism. Weiss thinks that the words associating Christ's death with baptism (Luke xii. 49 ff.) are genuine. "Jedenfalls kann nicht mehr behauptet werden, dass diese mysterienhafte Auffassung der Taufe dem Kreise Jesu und der Urgemeinde fremd gewesen wäre"; cp. *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft*, Bd. xvi. (1913), "Das Problem der Entstehung des Christentums," SS. 441-2.

² "I was united with thy sacred form (*μορφή*), I was strengthened by thy holy name"; cp. Wessely, *Zauber Pap.* i. p. 48. This new *μορφή* is the result of initiation. We have to think of the spiritual body of St. Paul, as not merely something acquired at the resurrection, but something that begins to be built up in the Christian from the time that the Holy Spirit has taken possession of him.

Christ,"¹ nor, in the pagan rites of initiation, is there the paramount emphasis laid on sin and guilt that we find in the teaching of St. Paul in regard to baptism. It is just possible that, originally, Christian baptism was entirely a baptism for repentance, similar to that of the Essenes, and that only gradually it became a baptism for conversion, or initiation into the new sanctified life of faith, and the life of the Holy Spirit, as it is in the case of St. Paul. The source of inspiration in Christian baptism and in that of the pagan rites of initiation was fundamentally different, for, while in paganism the driving force was the dread of Fate and the longing to be delivered from its tyranny, in Christian baptism it is the fervent desire to be delivered from sin, bound up with a sincere repentance, a glowing faith in Jesus Christ, and a fervid love for Him.

It has been asserted that "the doctrine which the New Testament really teaches regarding the Lord's Supper cannot be derived, even collaterally or by way of supplement, from pagan sources."² Of what is most distinctive and most valuable in the teaching regarding the Lord's Supper, this is true. But, at the same time, it has not only to be recognised that the pagan religions had their communion feasts, but that these feasts also embody principles which lie at the foundation of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. Beneath both there is the twofold longing, probably the most intense of all longings of the human heart, for communion with Deity

¹ Cp. Gal. iii. 27. It is true that there were secret words pronounced at the Eleusinian initiation (cp. 'Ἰερὸν ἔτεκε πόντια κοῦρον βριμὸν βριμὸν, *Hippol. Philosop.* v. p. 171); but these words were probably just short formulæ, explaining the meaning of the rites and sacred things, similar to the formulæ on the Orphic tablets, given to guide the souls of the departed. The use of the phrase "in the Name of Christ" at baptism implied that the baptized forthwith became the property of Christ, under whose protection they henceforth remained; cp. 1 Cor. i. 13, vi. 11; Acts ii. 38, viii. 16, x. 48, xix. 5. It implied mystical union with Christ, and the destruction of the dominion of all antagonistic demoniacal forces. "Sondern mit realen, mystischen, geheimnisvollen Wirkungen verbunden gedacht ist"; cp. Weiss, *Das Urchristentum*, S. 497.

² Cp. Clemen, *Primitive Christianity*, p. 266.

and with the dear dead. This is found, either with or without¹ an associated mystic feeling, in diverse faiths.²

Both in Greece and in Rome funeral banquets were held,³ at which it was believed the spirits of the dead were present. While, from the earliest times, the tomb was regarded as being the home of the dead, it was thought that the spirit of the departed was not inseparable from his remains, and that the shades could come and sit among the guests and share with them the food and wine. As the spirits of the departed were believed to be much more powerful after, than before, death, and, as they were believed to be miserable under the new conditions, and therefore likely to be malevolent, it was not merely the desire for communion with them that inspired these feasts, but also dread of what the shades might do if they thought themselves neglected.

When, in the Lord's Supper, we find the twofold conception of communion with God and communion with the saints living and dead, this cannot be regarded as an absolutely novel or original idea. It is another manifestation of what had long been a feature of the pagan sacramental feasts. Christianity, in this, as in so much else, was only a new current in the mighty river of the general religious life of humanity.

Then there is the use of wine as symbolic of life, and specially of the life of deity. Wine was regarded as the drink of immortality, because through it came intoxication, and because to be intoxicated was divine possession. It was a primitive belief of the pagan mind that the juice of the grape was in itself divine, that the spirit of deity

¹ There is nothing mystical in the Homeric feast of communion with the gods.

² "Des repas sacrés fréquemment renouvelés maintiennent la communion entre les mystes et Cybèle ou Mithra, tandis qu'un service quotidien ravivait sans cesse la foi des dévots d'Isis"; cp. Cumont, *Les Religions orientales*, p. 52.

³ In Greece, the ceremony took place thrice, either on the third, ninth, and thirtieth day, or on the third, seventh, and fortieth day. In Rome, it took place immediately after the funeral, and was repeated on the ninth day.

himself was in it.¹ Similarly human blood was regarded as the seat of life, so that sprinkled blood was believed to give new life even to the dead.² In view of this, it cannot be regarded as accidental that wine and blood are so intimately associated in the Lord's Supper. Behind the association there is a tradition which stretches back into the earliest times.³

There is a similar tradition in regard to the sacramental use of bread, or the raw grain, the ear of wheat. Bread has long been regarded as the staff of life, and the corn from very early days as the symbol of immortality.⁴

In the ritual of Dionysus, who died periodically, there was the sacramental drinking of blood, and the eating of raw flesh. The victim that was torn in pieces might be a human being.⁵ Speaking in absolute reverence, and never for a moment forgetting the difference in spiritual atmosphere, we cannot help remembering the "shed blood" and "My Body" of the Lord's Supper,⁶ nor

¹ Cp. Farnell, *The Cults of the Greek States*, v. p. 121. Prodicus of Ceos affirmed that Demeter was the bread, and Dionysus the wine; cp. Cicero, *De Natura Deor.* i. 42; *Sext. Empir.* ix. 18.

² Life was held to be in the blood, because life ebbs in proportion to the loss of blood, and also because of the bloodless pallor of the corpse. For the blood and the other self in a man, cp. Lods, *La Croissance à la vie future*, p. 67 f.

³ The use of the "krater," or cup, was probably Orphic in origin.

⁴ Cp. the intimate association of Demeter with grain; cp. "An ear of corn reaped in silence" (Hippolytus, *Philosoph.* v. p. 171); cp. 1 Cor. xv. 37; cp. Luke xxii. 19; cp. the relief found at Eleusis, representing Demeter as giving Triptolemus the corn-ears that he may go out and teach; cp. Rostovtzeff, *A History of the Ancient World*, p. 290.

⁵ Cp. Farnell, *The Cults of the Greek States*, v. p. 164. It has to be remembered that the slaughtered victim was almost certainly identified with the god himself; cp. the confession of the Cretan initiates: "Pure has been my life's course, since I was initiated in the mysteries of Zeus of Mount Ida. I have accomplished the thunders of night-roving Zagreus and the feast of the eating of raw flesh; I have borne the torches for the Mountain Mother, and, having attained sanctification, I have received the name of Bacchus of the Armed Youth. And now, clothed all in white raiment, I shun contact with human birth and with the burial of the dead, and watchfully eschew the eating of things that have a living soul" (Euripides, *Cretans*, *Frag.* 472).

⁶ Bread and wine were consecrated and distributed among the faithful Mithraists. A bas-relief (Dalmatia), showing the sacrament of Mithraism, is strongly reminiscent of the Lord's Supper.

that it was to the early Christians, as to us now, not only the feast of the Crucified, but also of the Risen Lord.

There is no question of denying that the Lord's Supper has a character of its own, a sublimity, sanctity, and religious value, which place it immeasurably higher than any of the pagan sacramental feasts. It may even be impossible to find any direct historical connection between the origin of the Lord's Supper and any of these pagan sacraments. But that there are elements in common, and that the Lord's Supper implies a background of religious belief and practice, cannot be denied.

This applies equally to Christian Baptism, and may be illustrated from several sources. The mysteries of Attis included both a sacramental meal and a baptism in the blood of a slaughtered bull. Those who were baptized were regarded as born again, and, henceforth, endowed with immortal life. For some time after the ceremony the baptized were treated as infants and fed on milk.¹ There was the sacred banquet of Isis, and the papyri speak of "the table of the Lord Serapis."² In the worship of the great mother Cybele, the bread and wine partaken of at initiation were believed to insure immortality.³

In the Taurobolium,⁴ or bath of blood, barbarous and crude as it was, we have at least some features which are

¹ Cp. 1 Cor. iii. 2, "I have fed you with milk"; cp. Frazer, *The Golden Bough*, pt. iv. pp. 228-9; cp. ἐκ τυμπάνου βέβρωκα ἐκ κυμβάλου πέπωκα, γεγονός μύστης Ἀττεως (Firmicus Maternus, *De error. profan. relig.* 43, 15); cp. Clement of Alexandria, *Exhortation to the Greeks*, ii. 14. The formula is apparently very old. Firmicus associates it with a man who is about to die (*moriturus*). It seems to have been a widespread custom to give a drink of milk and honey to newly born babes. A drink of milk and honey was given to the newly baptized. Clement of Alexandria calls the Christians "galaktophagoi," or milk-drinkers.

² Cp. Milligan, *Here and There among the Papyri*, p. 101.

³ Cp. Cumont, *After Life in Roman Paganism*, p. 36. It has to be remembered that Cybele was originally the goddess of the dead.

⁴ The Taurobolium was probably so called because the bull was hunted and lassoed; cp. Cumont, *Les Mystères de Mithra*, p. 191. It was originally a rite of the Great Mother; cp. Dill, *Roman Society from Nero to Marcus Aurelius*, p. 609. "Il paraît indubitable que le taurobole fut pratiqué déjà en Asie Mineure dans le culte de Mâ-Bellone"; cp. Cumont, *Les Religions orientales*, p. 268 n. 32.

suggestive of the nature and meaning of Christian baptism. There is the descent into the pit at the Taurobolium, and the descent into the water at Christian baptism. The blood of the bull purifies, as does also the water of baptism. In both cases, there is emphasis laid on regeneration. In both cases, the result is eternal life ("in æternum renatus").

The guilds or brotherhoods had their common meals of a distinctively religious character, at which wine was drunk.¹ They used the consecrated cup,² and could speak of "the table of the god."³

Altogether, it is obvious that there are points of resemblance between the rites of paganism and the Christian sacraments, and also essential differences. One might think of the relationship thus. Both are branches of the same tree; but the Christian is the higher branch, more perfectly developed than the others, and open to the sky and the full light of the sun, and so differing from the others alike in its position and in the graceful beauty and perfection of its development. At the basis of both is the conception of mystic union between the worshipper and his God through participation in the rites of initiation and the sacred meal.⁴ There is communion with the heroic dead of paganism,⁵ and communion of the saints of the Christian Church. There is clearly a mystical element about the sacraments of St. Paul as about the pagan rites. When the early Christians conceived of the Church as the mystical body of Christ, it was only natural that they should think of the

¹ Cp. Poland, *Geschichte des Griechischen Vereinswesens*, SS. 258 ff.

² Cp. *ibid.* SS. 475 (ποτήριον), 476 (κρατής); cp. (Hermetic literature) Mead, *Thrice-Greatest Hermes*, ii. p. 94 (The cup is the body of God).

³ Cp. Poland, *op. cit.* S. 477.

⁴ Weiss rightly distinguishes between two conceptions of the Lord's Supper, both of which are to be found in St. Paul's conception. "Die ältere, aus der Urgemeinde stammende, wonach die Mahlzeit vor allem ein Akt der Gemeinschaft der Jünger ist, in dem sie Gott für den gemeinsamen religiösen Besitz danken und das Brot brechen, wie Jesus es gebrochen hat, und die jüngere, hellenistische, wonach der Herr selber nicht nur der Mittelpunkt, sondern irgendwie auch der Gegenstand der Feier ist"; cp. *Das Urchristentum*, S. 502.

⁵ Cp. Rohde, *Psyche*, S. 25.

sacraments of the Church also in a mystical way. Both in paganism and in St. Paul, initiation and the sacred meal are inseparably bound up together. In the Primitive Church, the sacrament of baptism was immediately followed by holy communion.¹

But it is undoubted that there are differences so fundamental, so essential, that, in the last issue, we may even claim for the Christian sacraments that they belong to a category of their own, are indeed *sui generis* in the whole history of the religious life of man. There is an acute sense of the horror of sin, a demand for sincere repentance, the imperative need of forgiveness by God, the necessity for an entire ethical change and transformation of life, sanctification, holiness, in connection with the Christian sacraments, for which you look in vain to paganism. Even participation in the sacraments, according to St. Paul, would not save a man, if, in the meantime, he should relapse into the slavery of sin. In paganism, the rites were held to possess a salutary power for all time, no matter what the initiate or participant might subsequently do. What a different grasp of ethical values and the eternal verities does St. Paul's understanding involve! Then, in the Christian sacraments, there is no thought of ultimate identification with Deity. There is simple communion between the spirit of the faithful and God, and with one another. How much truer and more sublime is the conception of God implied in the Christian view! Then there is a direct personal note, both from God's and man's point of view, in the conception of the Christian sacraments, which is not found in paganism. The redemptive power of the Christian gospel operates in an immediate, personal way. Every man must find the path of salvation himself. It is essentially a personal discovery and appropriation. God the Father is a Person, God the Son is a Person, God the Holy Spirit is a Person. In the Christian sacraments, with all their mystical elements, there is the

¹ Cp. Harrison, *Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Religion*, p. 597.

dominant note ringing out clear as a bugle—the personal note. In paganism it is different. There, the paraphernalia of the sacred rites obscure the personal note. Deissmann believes that the “*Marana tha*” was “the cry of prayer” specially used at the close of communion.¹ In all human utterance, is there a cry of the naked soul of the believing man to his Personal Lord and Redeemer comparable with this?

¹ Cp. *St. Paul*, p. 118.

CHAPTER VIII

DEATH AND THE AFTERWARDS

ESCHATOLOGY occupies a very important place in the teaching of St. Paul,¹ and most of his meaning is clear. Some things also are uncertain and obscure. In regard to the final fate of the wicked, for example, he shows great reserve, so that the student of his thought is often left with a feeling of uncertainty as to what he really meant. We cannot be positively sure even as regards the order of final events² in his scheme of last things.

¹ In New Testament eschatology, Charles finds certain elements of incongruity, resembling those found in the Old Testament. These he would explain as survivals of less developed religious beliefs; cp. *Eschatology*, p. 366. Charles, however, does not follow the strict chronological order of the New Testament writings in his study of its eschatology; cp. *Eschatology*, p. 369. Charles finds a gradual development of St. Paul's eschatology, "a slow and progressive transformation, during which the great apostle passes from an eschatological standpoint largely Judaistic to one essentially Christian"; cp. *Eschatology*, p. 368. The four stages of development, according to Charles, are represented by: (1) 1 and 2 Thessalonians; (2) 1 Corinthians; (3) 2 Corinthians and Romans; (4) Philippians, Colossians, and Ephesians. But there is a certain artificiality in this presentation, and it perhaps reads more into St. Paul's words than is justifiable. It has always to be remembered that St. Paul had a clear grasp of Christ's eschatological teaching at least from the time that he wrote his first letter. What he presents in 1 Thess. iv. 15-17 is from the Lord.

² The following seems to be the most likely sequence of events: the sudden return of the Lord Jesus Christ; a destructive fire; everything exposed in an all-penetrating light; the complete and final destruction of all resistance to God; the dead awake in response to the trumpet-call; the faithful dead who are still in the grave undergo a complete change and rise; Christ appears as Judge; the wicked, alike those still alive at the Parousia and those long dead, are tried and condemned; the wicked angels are at the same time condemned; the saints of God go with Christ to live and reign with Him through eternal years. For a somewhat different order, cp. Morgan, *The Religion and Theology of Paul*, p. 229.

Speaking generally, the eschatology of St. Paul is essentially the eschatology of Judaism, particularly that of the Jewish apocalyptic writings,¹ and of the teaching of Jesus. At the same time, in this as in so much else, he shows himself to be the gatherer-up of valuable fragments which had come to him and his age from many lands and many periods of time.

A primitive belief in regard to death was that it is an unnatural occurrence, caused by the malevolent influence of demons, or by sorcery.² When St. Paul believed that death was due to Adam's sin, and not part of the original purpose of God in regard to His highest creation, we do not have quite the same idea ; but St. Paul at least implies that death is, in the last issue, an unnatural experience, because it was not part of the original plan of God.

There is no evidence, either in St. Paul's letters, or in the biographical notes of Acts, that he ever was in Egypt, or was in any way immediately influenced by Egyptian thought. But not only was ancient Egypt the land possessed in an unique degree of what might be called the genius for immortality, but, long before St. Paul was born, the influence of Egyptian beliefs and doctrines had spread far and wide over the lands with which St. Paul had to do, and had in a significant way moulded the beliefs of Judaism. When St. Paul says, "Thou foolish one, that which thou thyself sowest is not quickened, except it die," we may not be able to trace the utterance back directly to its primal fountainhead ; but who can doubt that if we were able to do so, we should eventually reach the faith of Osiris ?³

In the history of Greek thought as regards death, there is much that can have had no influence on St. Paul's view, and much more which, indirectly or directly, helped to mould his beliefs. There is, as it were, the

¹ Cp. Weinel, *St. Paul*, p. 55.

² Cp. Frazer, *The Belief in Immortality*, i. pp. 33 ff.

³ In the religion of Osiris, the ear of wheat cut is the symbol of death ; cp. Foucart, *Les Mystères d'Éleusis*, p. 440. (There must be the reaping before there is the subsequent sowing.)

negative and the positive sides of the picture. It is the latter only which really counts, so far as St. Paul is concerned, though his familiarity with the former is implied in his own words, "How say some among you that there is no resurrection of the dead?"¹

Heraclitus, while convinced that there was no such thing as absolute death, and while regarding death as being only a transitional point in the continuous process of life, knows nothing of what we mean by the personal survival of the individual. Much more negative is a fourth-century comedy which gives vivid expression to the belief that physical death is the end of all personal existence: "Drink and play: death ends our life, and short is our time on earth. But, once we are dead, there is no end of death."² This is the typical Epicurean view, with which we know St. Paul to have been familiar.³ The Stoics believed in the survival of the souls of men for a time. They thought of them as subsisting in the atmosphere, particularly in its highest part, adjacent to the circle of the moon. But to the Stoics, even the soul, just like the corporeal body, eventually dissolved into the elements of which it was composed. Rohde maintains that, in the majority of inscriptions from Greek tombs, there is no definite mention of immortality.⁴ There is evidence that the belief in immortality seriously declined towards the latter end of the Roman Republic.⁵ This was due partly to a negative philosophy, partly to a decay of the religious sense, and partly to a general slackening of the moral life. The rejection of belief in immortality was probably more conspicuous among the cultivated than among the uneducated classes.

¹ Cp. 1 Cor. xv. 12.

² Cp. Amphis, *Gynæcocratia*; Cornford, *Greek Religious Thought*.

³ Cp. 1 Cor. xv. 32.

⁴ Cp. *Psyche*, ii. S. 381.

⁵ Cp. Cumont, *After Life in Roman Paganism*, p. 17. Cumont says that "faith in the future life was reduced to a minimum." Speaking of the *Corpus Inscriptionum*, he says, "We are struck by the small number of the epitaphs which express the hope of immortality" (p. 18); cp. "Non fui, fui, non sum, non curo" ("I was not, I was, I am not, I do not care"); cp. Dessau, *Inscript. selectæ*, 8162.

While thus there was, alike in Greek and Roman life, a certain amount of negation as regards the belief in immortality, in the entire flood of progressive human life, this is not to be regarded as amounting to more than a subordinate current, which is to be accounted for by temporary tendencies of the time. Humanity, as far as we can gather, at all times and on the whole, has had yearning beliefs in immortality.

In Greek faith, we find an intimate association of death with deity,¹ who was lord of death. Man, on the other hand, was felt to be helpless in the face of death. Plato, however, held that the philosopher, by rising above the body, and, as it were, freeing himself from the bondage of the flesh, could face death without fear.² Both Sophocles and Euripides held the lugubrious view that death was desirable, a thing to be welcomed.³ The Stoics emphasised the view that the main purpose of life is certainly not to be preparing for death.

In the Hermetic literature there is a great deal that is suggestive of the Christian view of death. It is tragically recognised that man, from his very nature, is doomed to die,⁴ that he is indeed a deity on earth subject to death.⁵ Death is regarded as a dissolution of the body,⁶ or of a

¹ Hecate, for example, is intimately associated with death, the corpse, burial, and cemeteries. Hermes, who played such an important part in the religious life of Greece, was the male corresponding to Hecate.

² Cp. *Phædo*, 63 B. "If you have a pious mind, no harm will come to you when you die"; cp. Epicharnus (the Sicilian comic poet, c. 467 B.C.), *Frag.* 22.

³ "Never to be born is, past all reckoning, best; next best, by far, when a man has come into the world, that, as soon as possible, he should return thither whence he came"; cp. Sophocles, *Ædip. Colon.* 1225. Similarly, Euripides regards birth as a thing to be lamented, death as a thing to be rejoiced over; cp. *Cresphontes*, *Frag.* 449.

⁴ Cp. The Key of Thrice-Greatest Hermes, § 12: "But man, in that he is subject both to motion and to death, is evil" (cp. St. Paul's connection between sin and death); cp. Of Justice, § 2 (cp. St. Paul and the connection between the flesh, fleshly passions, sin, and death).

⁵ Cp. The Key of Thrice-Greatest Hermes, § 25.

⁶ With the dissolution of the body, there is the disappearance of corporeal sense; cp. Mead, *Thrice-Greatest Hermes*, ii. p. 360 (The Perfect Sermon, xxvii. § 4).

compound,¹ or of soul and mind,² an increase and a decrease.³ Death cannot touch essential birth.⁴ Death is conceived of as striking a tent, reminding us of St. Paul's simile.⁵ The death to be dreaded is not physical death, but a second death.⁶ This latter distinction is not to be confused with another, which is suggested in the Mystery religions and finds an echo in St. Paul, namely, that between physical death and what might be called voluntary death.⁷

When St. Paul says that of all men we should be the "most pitiable," if our hope in Christ were limited to this life only, he is expressing the wretched feelings of many a pagan, an expression of which we find an echo in the papyri, "Truly there is nothing any one can do in the face of such things."⁸

Turning to Judaism, we recognise that, until long after the Exile, the Jews held the common view of the ancient world, namely, that at death the dead passed into the realm of shades (Sheol), from which there was no return (Beliyaal), the place of everlasting silence (Dumah) and oblivion (Neshiyah), a spectral existence, stripped of clear conscious life, and with no hope of

¹ Cp. About the Common Mind of Hermes to Tat, § 16 (dissolution is not destruction, but a preparation for renewal).

² Cp. Mind unto Hermes, § 14.

³ Cp. That No One of Existing Things doth Perish, § 3.

⁴ Cp. The Secret Sermon on the Mountain, § 14 (the natural body must die, but death cannot "touch" the essential birth).

⁵ Cp. 2 Cor. v. 1; cp. The Secret Sermon on the Mountain, § 15.

⁶ "As to this death [*i.e.* physical], anxiety is needless. But there's another [death] which no man can escape, but which the ignorance and unbelief of man think little of"; cp. The Perfect Sermon, § 4.

⁷ "The very act of dedication is regarded as a voluntary death and an imperilling of life" (words of the high priest of Isis at Eleusis to Apuleius). The reference here is explained, however, in view of the fact that it is those whose term of life is really ended whom the goddess chooses; cp. *The Golden Ass*, bk. xi. 21.

Reitzenstein would explain the death of Rom. vi. 1-14 as being neither a purely physical death, nor as a merely figurative death, but, in the light of the teaching of the Mystery religions, as a voluntary death by which we become freed from sin; cp. *Die Hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen*, SS. 101-3.

⁸ From a letter of sympathy sent to the bereaved, referring to death; cp. Milligan, *Here and There among the Papyri*, p. 107.

awakening to a better state.¹ Alongside of this, we find the belief that, at death, the dead went to the grave itself, which was the eternal home.² Further consideration of this will naturally fall to be given later on.

When we study the teaching of St. Paul in regard to death, we are profoundly impressed with the significance of Christ's death to him.³ The Crucified Jesus occupied a place secondary only to the Risen Lord in his system. The Crucified Jesus might even be regarded as absolutely identical with the Risen Christ.⁴ St. Paul knew both in the same mystical fellowship.

Now while we have abundant precedent for the death and resurrection of deity in the pagan faiths, and while we may even grant that there is a certain resemblance between these and St. Paul's Christ Crucified and Risen, there are also fundamental differences. The death and resurrection of Jesus were authentic historical facts to the members of the Primitive Church, and there were trustworthy witnesses, known to St. Paul personally, of both events. Further, unlike the pagan deities,⁵ Jesus Christ died and rose once for all.

To St. Paul, Christ's death was an historical event, which in itself occurred once for all; but which, nevertheless, in a mystical sense, was going on for ever, repeated in the life of fellowship which the Christian enjoyed in Him.⁶ The Christ Crucified is the Christ who saves;

¹ Cp. Job x. 21 f., xvii. 13, xxx. 23; Ps. lxxxviii. 4, xciv. 17, cxiv. 17.

² "Für קרקם ist natürlich mit LXX קררים zu lesen"; "Gräben sind ihre Häuser für immer"; cp. Duhm, *Psalmen*, S. 139.

³ Cp. 1 Cor. i. 23. Weiss is hardly right in thinking that Christ's death did not hold anything like a premier place in the belief of the Primitive Church; cp. "Das Problem der Entstehung des Christentums" (*Archiv für Religionswissenschaft*, Bd. xvi., 1913), S. 441.

⁴ Deissmann rightly translates the perfect *ἐσταυρωμένος* as "He who is the Crucified," and points out that it implies "a reality which can be experienced every day"; cp. *The Religion of Jesus and the Faith of Paul*, pp. 237-8.

⁵ There was, for example, the annual death and resurrection of Herakles.

⁶ Deissmann holds that "Paul's communion with Christ" is "the very centre of his religion." It is perhaps better to say that the very core of St. Paul's religion is found in his experience of possession by the Holy Spirit, who is Jesus Christ, the Risen Lord; cp. Deissmann, *The*

but this salvation is secured in the mystical life of fellowship with Him. It is interesting to compare St. Paul's understanding with the somewhat different view expressed in the Synoptic Gospels and in St. John.¹

As has been already shown, St. Paul connects the death of men with Adam's sin, and with the flesh as charged with passion. It is in the light of this that Satan's power over death must be explained.² St. Paul recognises a worse than merely physical death, namely spiritual, and, as we have shown, attached very great importance to mystical dying with Christ.³ As regards this latter, there is a possibility that he was influenced by pagan beliefs.⁴

We now pass to the consideration of personal survival and immortality. When St. Paul, in his great chapter on the "Christian Afterwards," said, "For this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must

Religion of Jesus and the Faith of Paul, p. 153. Deissmann finds that "in Christ" and "Christ in me" refer to the Exalted Christ. The genitive Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ is usually a mystical genitive and practically equivalent to "in Christ"; cp. *op. cit.* pp. 171 ff. "With Christ" (the more aristocratic expression) is eschatological, and refers to the looked-for condition of the saint in the completely realised spiritual body; cp. *op. cit.* p. 176. "In the blood of Christ" and "in the name of Christ" are both mystical"; cp. *op. cit.* p. 179.

¹ Vernes holds that in the Synoptic Gospels (as in the Epistle of James) it is the word, the life, of the Christ or Messiah, and not His death, that brings salvation to those who sincerely repent; cp. "Les Étapes de la déification de Jésus dans les livres du Nouveau Testament" (*Revue de l'histoire des religions*, 1918), p. 191. According to St. Mark, Jesus from the first announced His death, and intimated that it should be redemptive; cp. Mark ii. 20, x. 33 ff., 45, xiv. 22-4. St. Luke does not seem to have regarded the death of Jesus as redemptive; cp. Acts ii. 23 ff. St. John apparently accepted the view that the death of Jesus was redemptive; cp. John i. 29. Perhaps, rightly understood, there is no ultimate discrepancy between the view of the Gospels and St. Paul, because the redemption of Jesus is realised in the mystical life of fellowship with the Christ ever being crucified.

² Cp. 1 Cor. v. 5.

³ Cp. Rom. vi. 1-14; Gal. iii. 26 ff. While St. Paul, in his conception of dying and rising again with Christ, may have been so far influenced by similar pagan conceptions, we must remember that he understood the experience in a personal, spiritual way, whereas they understood it in a natural, psychical manner.

⁴ "Man wird sich dem Eindruck nicht entziehen können, dass hier die geistige Atmosphäre gegeben ist, innerhalb derer das paulinische Mitsterben und Mitaufstehen mit Christus steht"; cp. Bousset, *Kyrios Christos*, S. 171.

put on immortality,"¹ he not only gave vivid expression to the sublime Christian faith as regards the beyond, but his words are an echo of the all but universal longing and faith of mankind. It is an amazing fact, but none the less true, that belief in personal immortality has been, and is, held by almost the entire human race, even by primitive tribes practically destitute of all that we mean by culture.²

Frazer explains the origin of the belief in immortality in two ways.³ There is the internal way, that is, through dreams in which the dead seem to reappear. Starting from this, men went on to explain many things in everyday waking experience, specially what was thought to be malignant treatment, as being due to disembodied but surviving spirits. There is also, according to Frazer, the external way, namely this: people were impressed by the close resemblance of children to their dead forbears. Because of this, primitive folks postulated the reincarnation of the deceased. Perhaps these explanations will not go deep enough to satisfy many. Both these ways indeed describe influences which helped to foster the belief in immortality; but the foundation of the belief in human immortality lies deeper; it is probably instinctive.

Metaphysics cannot give us any "cogent proof of immortality,"⁴ nor can science give us "direct conclusive evidence for the existence of consciousness apart

¹ Cp. 1 Cor. xv. 53 (ἀθάνατα); cp. Nägeli, *Der Wortschatz des Apostels Paulus*, S. 18.

² "Der Glaube an das Fortleben der vom Körper getrennten Einzelseele ist allen primitiven Völkern eigen gewesen"; cp. Scheftelowitz, "Der Seelen und Unsterblichkeitsglaube im Alten Testament" (*Archiv für Religionswissenschaft*, Bd. xix. Hefte 2-3), S. 210; cp. Frazer, *The Belief in Immortality*, i. p. 33. Speaking of Mousterian man, Peyrony says: "Ce culte semble nous prouver qu'ils croyaient à une vie future"; cp. *Éléments de préhistoire*, p. 47.

³ Cp. *The Belief in Immortality*, i. pp. 27-8. For the reappearance of the dead in dreams, proving immortality, cp. Jastrow, *Religion of Babylonia and Assyria*, p. 567.

⁴ Cp. Galloway, "The Philosophy of Immortality" (*Immortality*, Marchant), pp. 120-1. Galloway rightly points out, however, that metaphysics "can show the weakness of arguments against it, and indicate possibilities in its [immortality] favour."

from life, or for the existence of a life apart from matter." ¹ The evidence, supporting the belief in personal immortality, must be sought in the realm of human instinct, in the spiritual and ethical life of man, ² and is above all associated with belief in a personal, interested, and loving God. It was the genius of a true discernment which led the ancient Greeks to think of divinity and immortality as inseparably bound up together. ³ In keeping with this, it may be laid down as a law that, in proportion as the conception of God became purer, the idea of personal immortality was strengthened and elevated. ⁴

The ultimate basis of a well-justified belief in personal immortality is faith in the almighty, just, and loving God, who cannot be conceived of as destroying that which fulfils His Will and ardently desires to continue doing so. ⁵ The certainty of the Christian faith in personal immortality derives its inspiration from the unique sublimity of the Christian conception of the God and Father of Jesus Christ, who is also our God and Father.

Exalted in its spiritual and moral constituents, the Christian belief in immortality is also exalted in its conception of the locale where the immortal life hereafter

¹ Cp. Barnes, "Science and Immortality" (*Immortality*, Marchant), p. 146.

² Cp. Eucken, "The Ethical Basis of Immortality" (*Immortality*, Marchant), p. 142.

³ Many of the deities of antiquity died and rose again, e.g. Osiris, Attis, Tammuz, Herakles, Mithras. It has to be noted, however, that these beliefs are explainable as either interpretations of the cycle of the seasons, or they have an astronomical origin. The death and resurrection of Jesus Christ, on the other hand, have a definite theistic background; the belief in them is essentially spiritual in its nature, and is in keeping with an ethic which originates out of the timeless life of the human spirit.

⁴ "Mit der Verinnerlichung des Glaubens an den einzigen Gott der absoluten Gerechtigkeit und Liebe ist die Vorstellung von der göttlichen Vergeltung nach dem Tode eng verknüpft"; cp. Scheffelowitz, "Der Seelen und Unsterblichkeitsglaube im Alten Testament" (*Archiv für Religionswissenschaft*, Bd. xix. Hefte 2-3), S. 230; cp. Charles, *Eschatology*, pp. 2 ff.

⁵ In the Old Testament we find a growing conviction that even in Sheol the departed were not forsaken by God; cp. Ps. xvii. 15, xxiii. 4, lxxiii. 26-8; Job xiv. 13 ff., xix. 26.

is lived. The home of the saints is the Jerusalem above. How much Christianity owes, in regard to the latter, to Chaldean theology, we cannot possibly compute. When the sages of Mesopotamia taught men to look to the starry heavens for deity, they also prepared the way for a loftier conception of immortality. Pagan theology taught that the soul of man came from the heavenly bodies,¹ and naturally, when its earthly history was completed, returned thither.² The heavens were the "spiritual home" of men freed from the bondage of the flesh. Belief in stellar immortality had long held a place in the faith of men. There is evidence of it in the Old Testament,³ and in St. Paul's own writings.⁴

St. Paul conceives of the victory over death which insures immortality to the Christian believer as the gift of God through Jesus Christ.⁵ In pagan belief too there is the note of victory; but there it is either personal virtue that secures this victory⁶ or immortality itself is that victory.⁷

Originating from various sources, a great stream of belief in immortality was flowing through the world of men long before St. Paul's day. Part of this was contributed by Babylonia. The god Marduk was depicted as having died, descended into the lower world, and risen again.⁸ Behind this belief there was the annual re-

¹ The sun was believed to be the source of generation and of reason; the moon, of the vital principle which nourished the body and caused its growth.

² The liberated soul mounted up to the sun; cp. Gressmann, *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, Bd. xli. S. 161. The most ancient precisely dated mention of stellar immortality is 421 B.C. "Aristophanes in his *Peace* (832 ff.) greets the apparition of a new star, that of the Pythagorean poet, Ion of Chios, who had recently died, asking ironically if it be not true that 'when some one dies he becomes like the stars in the air'"; cp. Cumont, *After Life in Roman Paganism*, p. 95.

³ Cp. Judg. v. 20; Dan. xii. 3. Cp. *Ass. Mos.* x. 9.

⁴ Cp. 1 Cor. xv. 41 ff.

⁵ Cp. 1 Cor. xv. 57.

⁶ The primitive meaning of the crown is that it is the symbol of the triumph which virtue wins over death; cp. Cumont, *Études syriennes*, p. 66 n.

⁷ "L'immortalité, nous l'avons dit, est souvent conçue comme une victoire remportée sur la mort;" cp. Cumont, *Études syriennes*, p. 100.

⁸ Cp. Langdon, *The Epic of Creation*, p. 194 n. 22.

currence of the seasons, the winter and spring sun. Part of the purpose for which man was created was "to enrich the field of the Anunnaki" after death.¹

By far the richest contribution comes from Egypt. "To the Egyptian, immortality was an axiom of life."² The belief in immortality was a salient feature of the religion of Osiris and Isis. Osiris "was primarily a god of life in death."³ He is the god of renewal, the renewal of Nature, and is himself continually renewed.⁴ It was through Osiris that personal immortality was secured.⁵ Before Osiris, the souls of men had to appear, were judged, and, if found worthy, passed on to the "blessed fields," a kind of other and glorified Nile valley.

With the introduction of Ra-worship which came from the East, the idea of a court was abandoned, and "the future life was regarded as the travel along with the company of the gods in the boat of the sun, across the heavens by day, and through the hours of darkness in night."⁶

¹ i.e. the lower regions; cp. Jastrow, *Religion of Babylonia and Assyria*, pp. 592-3.

² Cp. Flinders Petrie, *Immortality* (Marchant), p. 1. While it may be said, speaking generally, that "the ancients were signally indifferent as to the life to come," ancient Egypt was the marked exception to this rule; cp. Foakes-Jackson, *Studies in the Life of the Early Church*, p. 132. The primitive belief in Egypt was that the soul dwelt in and near the tomb, and needed to be nourished there.

³ Cp. Scott-Moncrieff, *Paganism and Christianity in Egypt*, p. 9. Flinders Petrie thinks that Osiris-worship probably came from the West. With it, the belief in immortality became more refined and ethical; cp. "Immortality" (*Immortality*, Marchant), p. 4.

⁴ Cp. the Pauline conception of the Christian life as a life continually being renewed.

⁵ "As truly as Osiris lives, shall he live: as truly as Osiris is not dead, shall he not die: as truly as Osiris is not annihilated, shall he not be annihilated" (from an ancient Egyptian text; cp. Erman, *Die Ägyptische Religion*, S. 111). The reference is to a devotee of Osiris. Speaking of the initiate of Osiris, Cumont says: "Il vivra non seulement comme une ombre ténue ou comme un esprit subtil, mais en pleine possession de son corps comme de son âme"; cp. *Les Religions orientales dans le paganisme romain*, p. 121.

⁶ Cp. Flinders Petrie, *Immortality* (Marchant), p. 5. The use of a ladder as a means of ascending up into heaven probably originated from the use of the ladder to mount up to the hut built in a tree. The designation "domus æterna" (cp. Eccles. xii. 5) is Egyptian in its origin; cp. Cumont, *Les Religions orientales dans le paganisme romain*, p. 280 n. 84. For Ra-worship and the probable influence

Still, even in Roman times, it was chiefly round Osiris that the belief in personal immortality and a home in the realm of spirits centred,¹ and it was the eschatological beliefs of Egypt which made the strongest appeal to the Latin world.²

The idea, belonging to the earliest ages of Egyptian history, of capturing a god and devouring him, with the purpose of so acquiring his divine qualities, while gross in itself, and altogether different in spirit, at least has a suggestion of the Lord's Supper, and the absence of that dread of returning spirits, found in other lands, may be regarded as at least a kind of tame antecedent of the joy and love of the Communion of saints.

From the contribution of Egypt, we pass to that of the Hellenic world. The conception of deity dying and rising again from the dead is probably not an original conception of the Hellenic mind, but a contribution borrowed from the non-Hellenic races.³ Still, at a very early period, in Greek thought, immortality and divinity were synonymous terms. This divine immortality was not a thing accessible to men, nor indeed to be desired by them, lest, in seeking it, they should stir up the jealousy of the gods.⁴

At the same time, alongside of this strict reservation of immortality properly speaking to the gods, there was a popular belief in a kind of shadowy survival, which, however, did not imply the persistence of the rational and thinking ego. Personal immortality, as we understand the term, was not, in popular Greek thought, an inherent possession of the human soul.⁵ The threefold from the East (the Egyptian campaign into Palestine and the Syrian coast-lands, c. 2670 B.C.), cp. Moret et Davy, *Des Clans aux empires*, pp. 211 ff.

¹ Cp. Scott-Moncrieff, *Paganism and Christianity in Egypt*, p. 7.

² Cp. Cumont, *Les Religions orientales dans le paganisme romain*, p. 123.

³ Cp. Farnell, *Greece and Babylon*, p. 27.

⁴ Cp. Pindar: "O my soul, seek not a life immortal," and "Seek not to become a god."

⁵ "Unsterblichkeit der Menschenseele als solcher vermöge ihrer eigenen Natur und Beschaffenheit, als der unvergänglichen Gotteskraft im sterblichen Leibe, ist niemals ein Gegenstand griechischen Volksglaubens geworden"; cp. Rohde, *Psyche*, ii. S. 378.

division of body, soul, and shade or spirit would only be reached at a comparatively late date ;¹ but the belief that there was a something which persisted after the body died reaches back into the far-distant past. The shrieking winds were ghosts.² The Ker and Erinyes probably originated in ghosts.³ The word "Anthesteria," from the verb-stem *θές*, probably means the festival of revocation, *i.e.* of calling back the ghosts of the dead.⁴ February was the month specially devoted to ceremonies which had to do with the riddance of terrors from the underworld.⁵ The ghosts of the dead were often malevolent.⁶ It was necessary to placate them by a ritual of purgation.⁷ The *pharmakos* rite was a rite of physical purification often associated with the placation of a ghost.⁸

Sometimes, however, the spirits were kindly disposed, coming to the aid of mortal men in straits.⁹ Among the Bœotians, Plutarch tells us, the first day of the Anthesteria was known as the day of the "Good Spirit."¹⁰

¹ This threefold division probably originated in Egypt. It is first alluded to by a Greek critic, Aristarchus, and by the Roman poet Ennius, who were contemporaries about 200 B.C. ; cp. Cumont, *After Life in Roman Paganism*, p. 79.

² Cp. Harrison, *Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Religion*, p. 68 ; cp. Eph. ii. 2.

³ Cp. Harrison, *op. cit.* pp. 163 ff.

⁴ Cp. Harrison, *op. cit.* p. 48. "The Anthesteria was primarily a Feast of All Souls ; later, it became a revel of Dionysus" ; cp. Harrison, *op. cit.* p. 55 ; cp. Murray, *Four Stages of Greek Religion*, p. 30. The Tammuz festival, which was originally a solar festival kept in the fourth month, as the summer solstice drew nigh, was, later on, in keeping with Ishtar's mourning for Tammuz, a kind of "All Souls' Day," when people remembered their dead.

⁵ Cp. Harrison, *op. cit.* p. 51.

⁶ Cp. Cornford, *Immortality* (Marchant), p. 19.

⁷ Cp. the *ἐναιγισμοί*.

⁸ Cp. Harrison, *op. cit.* p. 114.

⁹ Cp. the story told by Dicæus, son of Theocydes, an Athenian, who, when Attica was laid waste by the Persians, saw a cloud of dust, as if raised by the marching of thirty thousand men, advancing from Eleusis. He heard the singing of the mystic hymn to Dionysus, "the song of Iacchos." The dust moved towards Salamis. "So they knew that the fleet of Xerxes would surely perish" ; cp. Herodotus, viii. 64.

¹⁰ Cp. Plutarch, *Q. Symp.* viii. 3. The *ἀγαθὸς δαίμων*. There can be little doubt that this twofold conception of the spirits as malevolent and beneficent is the origin of the two kinds of demons which play such an important part in New Testament times. Cp. Weigall, *Tutankhamen, and Other Essays*, pp. 110-26, giving interesting examples of modern belief in the malevolence of the spirits of ancient Egyptians.

When Odysseus visited the land of the dead, and had performed the necessary rites, a great and melancholy crowd of shades emerged, and gathered round him.¹ Hades, to the Greeks of Homeric times, was a place of sordid misery.² Achilles' words to Odysseus were, "I would rather be on earth as the hired servant of another, in the house of a landless man with little to live upon, than be king over all the dead." Once the body was burnt, the shade was free to depart to the shadowy monotony and misery of Hades, to abide there for ever.³ Part of the vocation of the chthonian gods was to convey the souls of the dead into their deep.⁴

The Greek conception of immortality owes a very great deal to the religion of Dionysus.⁵ Dionysus periodically disappeared into another world, and periodically returned. His devotees, transported by the wild music and dancing, felt themselves to have part in his life.⁶

Orphism was mainly eschatological.⁷ The Orphic

¹ *Odyssey*, XI. ii. 204, 475. Odysseus dug a trench, cut the throat of a sheep, and when the dark blood flowed into the trench, "the shades of them that are dead and gone began to gather themselves out of Erebus, brides and unwedded youths, and old men that had endured much, and tender maidens with their grief yet fresh at heart, and many wounded with bronze-pointed spears, men slain in battle, wearing their blood-stained arms. A great multitude came from every side about the trench with a strange crying, and pale fear took hold upon me."

² How different from this picture of gloom is that presented by the Syrian conception of the soul as borne aloft by a bird, specially the eagle, bird of the sun! By the fifth century, however, the term *μακάριοι* "the blessed ones," was generally used of the departed; cp. Aristophanes; cp. Farnell, *Greek Hero Cults*, p. 390.

³ "Für Homer hat die Seele, einmal gebannt in den Hades, keine Bedeutung mehr"; cp. Rohde, *Psyche*, i. S. 37.

⁴ These chthonian gods also fostered and blessed the produce of the fields, and in some cases intimated coming events.

⁵ According to Rohde, the first clearly articulated example of "der Glaube an das unvergänglich ewige Leben der Seele" is found in a mystic sect devoted to the cult of Dionysus; cp. *Psyche*, ii. S. 3.

⁶ The Dionysiac religion differed fundamentally from the Olympian in this, that the former denied that there was any impassable barrier between the gods and men. The Dionysiac religion affirmed that there was one vital principle shared in common by gods, men, and even the animals; that apotheosis could be aspired to even by the humblest of mortals; that the soul is independent of the flesh, and that it can in a special way realise that independence through ecstasy and purification.

⁷ In the Orphic eschatology there was belief in (1) "the doctrine of purgative punishments"; (2) "the doctrine of reincarnation through

religion guaranteed immortality and a blessed hereafter at least to those who had been duly initiated,¹ and knew the sacred and mysterious formulæ requisite in order to make the journey safely in the land beyond death. To the Orphics, the soul was immortal, and passed through successive periods in the life on earth and in Hades, till at last it was finally delivered out of the weary round of mortal life by the full consecration and purification of Orphism.²

The Eleusinian Mysteries, like the Orphic, guaranteed a blessed hereafter to all who had been duly initiated. So strong was the assurance of the devotees, that death came to be regarded not as an evil, but as a good.³

When we turn to the philosophers and poets, we find further evidence of the belief in immortality among the Greeks, though not always with the same note of certainty which is so characteristic of the Mystery religions.

Heraclitus seems to have taught that, while birth was an evil, death was the beginning of real life. Through a cycle of existences"; cp. Farnell, *Greek Hero Cults*, p. 377 (neither of these doctrines appears in St. Paul). Orpheus himself goes down to Hades to rescue his wife Eurydice. He disobeyed Pluto by turning round, and so Eurydice had to stay in Hades; cp. Apollodorus, *Library* i. iii. 2 (Cornford, *Greek Religious Thought*); cp. Kern, *Orphicorum Fragmenta*, S. 19 (63, 65, 66). Speaking of the Mysteries of Greece, Farnell says, "Most of which had probably begun from the sixth or fifth century onwards to offer some eschatologic promise to the initiate"; cp. *Greek Hero Cults and Ideas of Immortality*, p. 373. For Orphic influence on Christian eschatology, cp. Boulanger, *Orphée, rapport de l'Orphisme et du Christianisme*, pp. 127 ff.

¹ Farnell points out that it is in the private Orphic religious brotherhoods that we find "an ecstatic hope in a happy immortality, attained through communion"; but that, in the public and State cults of Dionysus, such aspirations are not recognised nor proclaimed; cp. *Greek Hero Cults*, p. 239. It was from Orphism that Greek thought derived its conception of the subterranean kingdom as being composed of two parts: (1) Tartarus, a dark abyss into which the wicked were plunged, there to suffer for their sin; (2) the Elysian fields, a place of fair meadows, dance, and song, the home of the blessed; cp. Cumont, *After Life in Roman Paganism*. Some sects, both of the Orphics and Pythagoreans, taught that the spirits of the dead departed to dwell in the moon, or to shine among the constellations; cp. Friedländer, *Roman Life and Manners*, iii. p. 290; cp. Cumont, *Astrology and Religion among the Greeks and Romans*, p. 175; cp. Reinach, *Cultes et religions*, iii. pp. 346-7.

² Cp. "I have flown out of the sorrowful weary wheel" (words supposed to be spoken by a deceased initiate of Orphism).

³ Cp. Farnell, *Greek Hero Cults and Ideas of Immortality*, p. 374; cp. Foucart, *Les Mystères d'Éleusis*, p. 368.

death, the soul, hitherto imprisoned and dead in the living body, comes to life again.¹

Pindar sets forth at least some kind of survival for the people belonging to the first four of his ages.² In every man there is an image which has come from the gods, and which survives death.³ After being incarnate in three virtuous lives, the soul finally escapes to dwell in the Islands of the Blessed.⁴

Plato, greatest of all Greek thinkers, and perhaps the most fertile mind that humanity has hitherto produced, sounds a note of certainty in regard to personal immortality, and links on the belief with ethics in a distinctive fashion. The soul survives because of its own inherent nature, for, according to Plato, there is no gulf between gods and men. Man is kin to the divine, and therefore immortal.⁵ The departed not only continue to exist after death, but they live in a world of moral values and distinctions.⁶

Aristotle, following the lead of Plato, held that the

¹ Cp. Clement of Alexandria, *Stromata*, iii. 3; Sextus Empiric; *Pyrrhon. Hyp.* iii. 230.

² The men of the Golden Age are now "good spirits, on earth, keepers of mortal men." The men of the Silver Age "beneath the earth are called blessed mortals." The men of the Bronze Age, "by their own hands slain, went down to the dank house of chill Hades, nameless." The men of the Heroic Age, "with soul untouched of sorrow, dwell in the Islands of the Blest by deep eddying Okeanos"; cp. *Works and Days* (Mair's translation), pp. 5-7.

³ "Alive there yet remains an image of the living man; for that alone is from the gods"; cp. Pindar, *Frag.* 131 (Cornford, *Greek Religious Thought*).

⁴ Cp. Pindar, *Olympian*, ii. 53. In Elysium, the blessed "mix incense of all kinds with far-shining fire on the altars of the gods"; cp. Dirges, *Frag.* 129, 130. The souls incarnate for the last time are the souls of "noble kings and men swift in strength and highest in wisdom, and for all time to come men call them pure heroes"; cp. Dirges, *Frag.* 133.

⁵ This view was probably derived from the cult of Dionysus. It was revived by the Orphics at Croton in South Italy in the sixth century B.C., and adopted by Pythagoras. The Pythagoreans taught that the soul was a portion torn away from the ether, and therefore immortal; cp. Diog. Lært. viii. 28.

⁶ "I have good hope that the dead have some sort of existence, and indeed, according to the old doctrine, an existence much better for the good than for the wicked"; cp. Plato, *Phædo*, 63 B (where he puts the words into the mouth of Socrates). The uninitiated were in a state of misery in Hades; cp. *Gorgias*, 492 D.

spirit is pure in its own nature, never becomes altogether fused with the body, and survives after bodily dissolution.

The Stoics, as we have seen, believed in a temporary survival ; the Epicureans, in keeping with their materialistic view of life, denied personal immortality.¹

A depressing note of gloom and uncertainty is struck by Euripides : " The life of man is all suffering, and there is no rest from pain and trouble. There may be something better than this life ; but whatever it be, it is hidden in mists of darkness." ² His words are in marked contrast with the cheery and comforting message of Antiphanes : " We should not mourn overmuch for those who are dear to us. They are not dead ; they have only gone before upon the road that all must travel. Some day we too shall come to the same inn, to spend the rest of time in their society." ³

Mithraism was characterised by a specially firm grasp of faith in immortality, and by the striking way that it linked up human destiny with the ethical life and ethical values. It met in a particularly wholesome manner the craving of the human heart for light on the afterwards. It taught that Mithras would come again, that at his coming the dead would rise to meet him, and that all evil would then be destroyed. Until this final consummation is achieved, the strict dualism characteristic of Mithraism holds good in the state after death.⁴ As in the Syrian cults, so in Mithraism, the souls of the pious are believed to be conducted to heaven by a divine psychopomp. The title " eagle " was one of the names given to the complete Mithraist, indicating that he had reached the highest grade. The eagle was intimately associated with the belief in immortality.⁵

¹ The Epicureans held that the soul, as being composed of atoms, dissolved at death.

² Cp. Hippolytus, 189.

³ Cp. Aphrodisius, *Frag.* 2 (Cornford, *Greek Religious Thought*).

⁴ Cp. Cumont, *Les Religions orientales dans le paganisme romain*,

p. 191.

⁵ " Le type artistique du personnage qu'un aigle emporte sur le dos est d'origine babylonienne " ; cp. Cumont, *Études syriennes*, p. 108. In

The Roman type of mind was essentially practical and this-worldly. Still, even in primitive times, the Romans evidently believed in some kind of survival of the soul, whose home after death was the grave. Later on, like many other peoples, the Romans conceived of the abode of the shades as an ill-defined region beneath the ground, where the present life was prolonged with its diverse vocations and social inequalities. On certain days the dead in Hades were permitted to emerge into the upper air.¹

While the rule seems to be that peoples who are still at a very low stage of culture regard the spirits of the dead as unhappy, and so malevolent, and while this was probably a characteristic of very early Roman days, still there is much evidence to show that the Romans tended to think of the departed as kindly disposed towards those who still survived, and as engaged in watching over and taking care of them.²

The Romans were characterised by a strong desire to be remembered after death. It was a fairly common practice to leave money in order to provide funds to defray the expenses of an annual memorial feast.

Considerable light is thrown on the Roman conception of immortality by Cicero's *Dream of Scipio*. It is only the body that is mortal. The real man is the mind, and, in virtue of possessing this, man is "a divine person." Personal immortality is definitely affirmed.³

Syria the eagle was the bird of the sun, and may have also symbolised the soul itself of the departed. Its use as the symbol of immortality on tombstones is very ancient. It carried the souls, not only of kings, but of commoners, aloft to the starry regions; cp. Cumont, *Études syriennes*, pp. 41, 56, 57, 102, 117.

¹ On the 24th August, the 5th October, and the 8th November, "the door of hell was opened and the dead had free access to the atmosphere." Apart from the above, the dead issued forth of their own accord at the Parentalia (13th-21st February) and the Lemuria (9th, 11th, and 13th May); cp. Cumont, *After Life in Roman Paganism*, p. 71.

² Cp. Dill, *Roman Society from Nero to Marcus Aurelius*, p. 488.

³ "To be sure they are alive (replied Africanus), for they have escaped from the fetters of the body as from a prison; that which is called your life is really death." (In answer to Scipio's question as to whether his father Paulus and others, "whom we thought dead," were yet alive.)

Heaven is declared to be peculiarly the home of all true patriots.¹

A large part of the secret of the attraction of the Egyptian cults of Isis and Serapis to many Roman minds lay in their promise of a blessed immortality with the gods for all pious hearts, *i.e.* for those who had been duly initiated.

In the early Roman empire, there was considerable belief in immortality, and also a certain amount of unbelief. The former was specially characteristic of the masses as compared with the more highly educated, who were inclined to scepticism, being strongly influenced by the negative philosophy of Epicurus.²

It cannot be said that the belief in personal immortality is a marked feature of the religion of Judaism. In this respect the Israelite differed signally from the Egyptian, and even from the devotee of the Greek Mystery religions.³ Spread as the books of the Old Testament are over a long period of time, it is not

¹ "The soul that is stirred and agitated by these [*i.e.* the noblest pursuits, specially those which have to do with the service of one's country] will fly the more quickly to this mansion [*i.e.* heaven], even to its own home, and this will be the more rapid if, even now while it is imprisoned within the body, it sallies abroad, and, contemplating those objects that are without it, abstracts itself as much as possible from the body." On the other hand, men who have devoted themselves merely to corporeal pleasures, "hover round the earth, nor do they return to this place till they have been tossed about for many years." The place to which true patriots go is "a radiant circle of dazzling brightness amidst the flaming bodies which you, as you have learned from the Greeks, term the Milky Way." "Whatever lies above the moon is eternal," and there is "the music of the spheres." For the very different conception of the Milky Way held by modern science, cp. Perrier, *The Earth before History*, p. 7.

² Cp. Dill, *Roman Society from Nero to Marcus Aurelius*, pp. 498 ff. When Nero sought to cut through the Isthmus of Corinth, the dead, by way of protest, arose from their graves; cp. Dio Cassius, lxi. 16. It is interesting to remember that there was a chained eagle set free at the funeral pyre of Roman emperors, and a similar practice at the funeral pyre of Sandan in Tarsus. Cumont believes that the Roman rite had an Asiatic source; cp. *Études syriennes*, pp. 73-4. The eagle was the bird of the sun, the bird of Jupiter, the human soul, the bird that carried the soul aloft, the bird of the Roman emperors, the mascot of the Roman army and the symbol of valour, and the mythological ancestor of certain dynasties.

³ Of course, in the eschatology of the apocalyptic literature of Judaism, immortality occupies a certain place.

surprising that there is neither a unified nor a precise doctrine of immortality.¹

Judaism was a religion which laid the main emphasis on the present life, and, in keeping with this, has little to say about the other side. The real life for Judaism was life with God, a life to be strenuously realised here and now, though, in the case of the great prophets at least, it was felt that the life of fellowship enjoyed here on earth could not conceivably be broken even by death.

The general attitude of the Israelites towards the belief in immortality is to be explained by their national experience.² They were a small nation fighting hard battles for their very existence. Their God Yahweh was a God of war, not a God of immortality. They had not the ample leisure of the ancient people of that mighty and secure empire on the Nile, to meditate on the afterwards.

Everything in the earlier days had to be looked at, in the first instance at least, from the point of view of the nation. The eschatology of Judaism had to do with the nation, not with the individual as such. In keeping with this, the seat of the perfected theocracy was on the earth, not in some other region.³

Yet, however strong the claims of the nation may be, the individual soul must assert its rights. So, in the Old Testament, there is an eschatology of the individual man as truly as there is an eschatology of the nation as a whole. There is evidence in the Old Testament pages of belief in the independence of the human soul, of its capacity to live a life of its own apart from the body.⁴ Just as, in

¹ Clemen notes a twofold tradition alike in a Jewish thought and in the New Testament: (1) a resurrection at the end of days; (2) the eternal life begins immediately after death; cp. *Primitive Christianity*, p. 168.

² It is a notable fact that Jewish eschatology, strongly national, and limited as it essentially was to the earth, nevertheless contained potentially the germs of a world-wide application. The foundation belief that God was one, was bound, logically and eventually, to lead to the belief in the unity of mankind.

³ Cp. Judg. xv. 19; 1 Sam. xxx. 12; 1 Kings xvii. 17 ff.; 2 Kings iv. 34 ff.

⁴ Cp. Gen. xxv. 8, xxxv. 18, xxxvii. 35; Num. xx. 24, 26; Deut. xxxi. 16; 2 Kings xxii. 20; Isa. xxxviii. 10. It is held by some that

sleep and in severe illness, the soul can separate itself from the body, so must it be in death.¹ That the soul, in some way, continued alive after death must have been a generally accepted belief. This is shown by the practice of burning the corpse,² which made it easier for the soul to depart to its new abode, and probably also by feasts of the dead³ similar to those with which we are familiar in Pagan practices.

The oldest belief in Israel, as among other primitive peoples, was probably that the soul remained in the vicinity of the corpse.⁴

But the conception of Sheol,⁵ the general abode of the dead, the belief that man was from the first destined for immortality cannot be proved by the presence of the tree of life in the Garden of Eden. Budde (*Biblische Urgeschichte*, SS. 48-59) has shown that, in the original narrative, there was only one tree, viz. that of good and evil; cp. Frazer, *Folklore of the Old Testament*, i. pp. 45 ff.

Enoch (Gen. v. 22-4) and Elijah (2 Kings ii. 11) are exceptional cases, and of a miraculous character. They certainly imply that mortal man can become immortal; but this immortality was conferred while they were still alive, i.e. they had not gone down to Sheol, the land of no return. In both cases, their claim to immortality is bound up with their life of communion with God. When, in Job xix. 26, we read, "Without my body shall I see God," this, according to Charles (*Eschatology*, p. 71 f.), does not mean "the blessed immortality of the departed soul," but it does mean participation in the higher life. Job's words are evidence for the later view held by the Jews that the soul of the pious is not cut off from God. Charles holds that in Job we find evidence that it was believed that the soul could continue to live independently and apart from the body. In Pss. xlix. and lxxiii., Sheol is the abode of the wicked only. Heaven is the home of the righteous. So Charles, *Eschatology*, p. 75.

¹ Cp. 1 Sam. xxviii.; Job xiv. 22.

² Cp. 1 Sam. xxxi. 12; 2 Chron. xvi. 14, xxi. 19; Jer. xxxiv. 5.

³ Cp. Deut. xxvi. 14; Hos. ix. 4.

⁴ Cp. Jer. xxxi. 15, where Rachel's soul is depicted as mourning beside her tomb over the misfortunes of her descendants.

⁵ It is generally recognised that there is at once similarity and difference between the Hebrew Sheol and the Babylonian Arallū. A bronze tablet found at Hamath in Northern Syria, and a duplicate of it found at Zurgal in Babylonia, give a representation of the universe. Resting on Apsu is Arallū, "a place full of horrors, and presided over by gods and demons of great strength and fierceness"; cp. Jastrow, *Religion of Babylonia and Assyria*, pp. 578-81. In the Second Tablet of the Gilgamesh Epic, col. iv. ll. 30-34, we hear how Engidu is carried away into the dark abodes of death:

"To that dwelling, which one enters, but comes not forth again,
To that road, whose course returns not again,
To that dwelling, to whose inhabitants light is denied,
Where earth is their food, clay their repast,
Covered are they, like birds, with feathers";

cp. Rogers, *Cuneiform Parallels to the Old Testament*, p. 83.

Arallū was the house of the dead, a great cavern deep down below

dead, became in course of time the generally accepted belief. Thither all souls must descend.¹ There, to some extent, they reawake,² though never completely. The dead are believed to retain their distinctive marks.³ The arrival of notabilities is believed to cause something like a sensation.⁴ Yet, even for those who were great and mighty on earth, the existence in Sheol is shrunken and attenuated. The voice of the deceased is like the feeble cheep of a bird.⁵ With it men cannot adequately praise God,⁶ though they can still make intercession for their people.⁷

The differences among those who are in the vast subterranean grave of Sheol are primarily not deter-

the surface of the earth. It has been suggested that the belief may point to the practice of cave-burial in the original home of the Babylonians. If a man was not properly buried, his shade did not reach Arallū, but his ghost ("ekimmu") wandered over the earth, and plagued the living; cp. King, *Babylonian Religion*, pp. 35, 44-5; cp. Jastrow, *Religion of Babylonia and Assyria*, pp. 183, 511-12. The gods were apparently nearer the dead than the living. Nergal was the chief god of the nether world. He was the god who symbolises the destructive midday sun, a god without mercy, and greedy for human victims for Arallū. Though the gods were near the dead, their condition was altogether wretched. Babylonian dirges do not so much express the sorrow of the survivors for the dead, as deplore the sad fate in store for the departed; cp. Jastrow, *Religion of Babylonia and Assyria*, p. 605.

While there are similarities between the Babylonian Arallū and the Hebrew Sheol, there are also important differences. Sheol is not part of the creation by God (Gen. i. ii.). In early Israel, it is the family grave that matters. The idea of Sheol was only gradually evolved from the combined family graves of the clan or nation; cp. Lods, *La Croyance à la vie future*, p. 210; Charles, *Eschatology*, p. 33; Pedersen, *Israel*, pp. 460 ff. Only in course of time did Sheol become the final abode of all mankind; cp. Ezek. xxxii. ; Isa. xiv. ; Job xxx. 23. Originally Sheol is outside the sphere of Yahweh (cp. Ps. lxxxviii. 5), whereas Arallū has its own gods, Nergal and Allatu. Every one goes to Sheol, whereas the deceased cannot enter Arallū unless the body has been buried. The inhabitants of Sheol were not naked; cp. 1 Sam. xxviii. 14 (Samuel has his mantle); Isa. xiv. ; Ezek. xxxii (cp., however, Job i. 21); whereas the inhabitants of Arallū are naked.

¹ Cp. Job xxx. 23.

² Cp. Isa. xxvi. 19; Dan. xii. 2. Cp. also 2 Kings iv. 31; Job xiv. 12. $\pi\pi$ is used of awakening from the sleep of death.

³ Cp. 1 Sam. xxviii. 14; Isa. xiv. 9; Ezek. xxxii. 27.

⁴ Cp. Isa. xiv. 9 ff.; Ezek. xxxii. 21 ff.

⁵ Cp. Isa. xxix. 4.

⁶ Cp. Ps. vi. 5, xxx. 9, cxv. 17; Isa. xxxviii. 18.

⁷ Cp. Jer. xv. 1; cp. Bêl in the lower regions prays for release, "Restore me to life"; cp. Langdon, *The Epic of Creation* (37), p. 41.

mined by moral reasons, but by social or racial differences already existing while the deceased lived on earth or by the manner of the burial of the dead.¹

Yet the good find a certain measure of peace even in Sheol,² while the wicked find none.³ Eventually the pious are taken to God,⁴ while the wicked find in Sheol a permanent abode.⁵

In Jewish apocalyptic literature there is considerable advance on the Old Testament eschatology. The idea of retribution becomes increasingly emphasised, and is made applicable to the individual rather than to the nation.⁶ The conception of Sheol is considerably enlarged and developed.⁷ The righteous are resurrected and pass to a blessed life on earth. Part of the sinners rise, and are thrust down into Gehenna, and part of the sinners are simply left in Sheol.

Dr. Charles says that "no Jewish book except 4 Ezra teaches indubitably the doctrine of a general resurrection, and this may have been due to Christian influence."

In the Hermetic literature, it is clearly set forth, not only that the soul of man is immortal, but that nothing

¹ Cp. Welch, "Hebrew and Apocalyptic Conceptions of Immortality," *Immortality* (Marchant).

² Cp. Gen. xv. 15; Isa. lvii. 2.

³ Cp. Job. xxxiv. 22; Isa. xiv. 18 ff., xlviii. 22, lvii. 21; Ezek. xxxii. 18 ff.

⁴ Cp. Ps. xlix. 15, ciii. 4; Job xii. 22. There are cases where the pious are taken to heaven while still in the body; cp. Gen. v. 24; 2 Kings ii. 11 ff. Cp. for the Old Testament doctrine of Sheol, Scheftelowitz, "Der Seelen- und Unsterblichkeitsglaube im Alten Testament" (*Archiv für Religionswissenschaft*, Bd. xix. Hefte, 2-3), SS. 210 ff.

⁵ Cp. Ps. ix. 17; Ezek. xxvi. 20-1, xxxii. 19-31.

⁶ In early Israel, retribution had to do with the community or tribe, rather than with the individual as such. It was not till late in the seventh century that the problem of individual retribution really emerged, and was dealt with by Jeremiah; cp. Jer. xxxi. 29-30; cp., however, Jer. xv. 4.

⁷ In the Book of Enoch there are four divisions of Sheol: (1) that containing the souls of the righteous who suffered a violent unmerited death; (2) that containing the souls of the righteous who did not die a violent unmerited death; (3) that containing the souls of sinners who escaped punishment in this life; (4) that containing the souls of sinners who suffered in this life, and so have milder treatment in Sheol.

in the universe of God can be destroyed.¹ At death, soul and body separate. The latter, with its special form, its senses, its passions, and its desires, is broken up, and each constituent element returns to its primal source.² The souls, liberated through death, realise their freedom, ascend to contemplate the Good, and are able to look back upon the early life as a mischance.³ They drink the deathless waters.⁴ They don their appropriate garment of fire.⁵ They go to the Father's home.⁶

It is probable that Philo regarded the human soul as being inherently immortal. To him, the Divine life is a possession here and now for those who are in the faith.⁷ With even greater emphasis than St. Paul, he distinguishes between the physical and the spiritual death.

Let us now turn to the consideration of St. Paul's views as regards immortality. Here, as elsewhere, the great apostle is debtor both to Jew and Gentile; but his own distinctive Christian contribution is by far the most valuable. Whether we look at his Jewish or his Gentile environment, St. Paul lived in a world which was strongly

¹ Cp. "That no one of existing things doth perish. But men in error speak of their changes as death and destruction." "For death is of destruction, and nothing in the Cosmos is destroyed," § 1 (Mead, *Thrice-Greatest Hermes*, ii. p. 125). "For if Cosmos is second God, a life that cannot die, it cannot be that any part of this immortal life should die. All things in Cosmos are parts of Cosmos, and most of all is man, the rational animal," § 1 (Mead, *op. cit.* ii. p. 125). "The soul of every man, O Asclepius, is deathless" (spoken by Trismegistus); cp. The Perfect Sermon, § 1 (Mead, *op. cit.* ii. p. 309); cp. Greek text of Reitzenstein, *Poimandres*, ch. i. §§ 15, 28 (ἐχούρες ἐξούριαν τῆς ἀθανασίας); cp. Scott, *Hermetica*, p. 177. According to modern science, "matter is neither eternal nor immutable"; cp. Perrier, *The Earth before History*, p. 3.

² Cp. *Poimandres*, § 24 (Mead, *Thrice-Greatest Hermes*, ii. p. 15).

³ Cp. The Cup or Monad, § 5, "The soul of the pious, freed by death, becomes pure mind"; cp. The Key of Thrice-Greatest Hermes, § 19.

⁴ *i.e.* the drink given by Isis to Horus; cp. *Poimandres*, § 29.

⁵ Cp. The Key of Thrice-Greatest Hermes, § 18; cp. St. Paul's "spiritual body."

⁶ Cp. *Poimandres*, § 26.

⁷ "This is the finest definition of immortal life—to be possessed with a (fleshless and bodiless) passion and friendship for God"; cp. *de fuga*, 58.

influenced by eschatological ideas.¹ These had laid a firm hold upon his mind, so much so that it is impossible to elucidate his entire system of thought without a clear understanding of his eschatology.

In keeping with that sanity of mind so characteristic of St. Paul, he refrains from presenting anything of the nature of a mere spectacular display in his description of the afterwards. It is doubtful whether St. Paul held the doctrine of the inherent immortality of the human soul.² That the soul could leave the body temporarily, even in this present life, is at least suggested by St. Paul ;³ but then it must be remembered that it is of St. Paul, one of the elect, that this possibility is suggested. In other words, even if we admit that St. Paul allowed to the soul the power to separate itself from the body for a time even in this life, that does not amount to saying that any human soul has this as an inherent power.

In any case, St. Paul was absolutely certain of the soul's life after physical death, of personal immortality, for the children of Jesus. But this just means that the basis of St. Paul's belief in immortality was not metaphysical, but moral and religious.⁴ St. Paul's belief in immortality is founded on the living and personal God and on man's spiritual fellowship with his God and Father. It means fellowship with God begun in this present life, and destined to become larger, richer, and fuller in the afterwards. It is altogether a fellowship of love—God's love for us, and our responsive love to

¹ Cp. "Die Bedeutung der Eschatologie für die Religion des Neuen Testaments" (*Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche*, 1917). Bultmann holds that the doctrine of the Primitive Church was essentially eschatological: "Wie die Stimmung in den Gemeinden, so lässt sich auch die ganze Gedankenwelt des Paulus einheitlich aus seiner Eschatologie verstehen" (S. 78). The three salient certainties to St. Paul are: (1) the Parousia; (2) the Resurrection; (3) the Consummation, in which the redeemed attain to the life of glory, and God's purpose in the world is completely realised.

² He differs from a large body of modern opinion which affirms personal survival apart from any definite religious beliefs.

³ Cp. 2 Cor. xii. 2; cp. "The soul, however, is not for ever in a mortal body, for it can be without the body"; cp. Of Energy and Feeling.

⁴ This is true of the immortality of the New Testament as a whole.

Him. It is a fellowship which is inspired with hope and assurance. It is bound up inseparably with redemption from sin and death.¹ Morality and immortality are inseparably wedded together, and to be morally right we must be redeemed from sin, which always means loss of fellowship with God. The state of redemption can only be realised by Christ being in us and we being in Christ. In that way there is mystical union between us and our Risen Lord who is the Holy Spirit, and that union is immortality begun even here and now.²

In the gentle tones of a mother soothing her child, St. Paul speaks of the departed as "them also that are fallen asleep in Jesus."³ But this does not mean that they are in what is commonly spoken of as "the intermediate state," though St. Paul must have been familiar with the idea.⁴

¹ Immortality is "the concomitant of redemption"; cp. Macintyre, "The Christian Idea of Immortality" (*Immortality*, Marchant), p. 86.

² "Denn das in Christus sein bedeutet doch bei ihm (*i.e.* Paul), ein völliges Verschmelzen mit dem himmlischen Herrn zu einer mystischen Einheit, wobei dann freilich die scharfen Umriss der personalistischen Vorstellung sich erweichen und der Gedanke des alldurchdringenden Christus-Geistes (2 Cor. iii. 17) sich einstellt"; cp. Weiss, "Die Bedeutung des Paulus für den modernen Christen" (*Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 1919-20), S. 140.

³ Cp. 1 Thess. iv. 14.

⁴ The Hebrew Sheol was an intermediate state for the righteous. In Orphism, the belief in an intermediate state (purgatory) is "made the corner-stone of an eschatologic doctrine." It was believed also in Orphism that the souls of the departed doing penance could "be released by ritual performed by the living"; cp. Farnell, *Greek Hero Cults and Ideas of Immortality*, p. 382; cp. baptism for the dead, 1 Cor. xv. 29. In Greek thought all souls had to go through an intermediate stage before the Styx was crossed; cp. Cumont, *After Life in Roman Paganism*, p. 76. The reference to "the spirits in prison" (cp. 1 Peter iii. 19) is probably to rebel angels or demons, not to the souls of men in Hades, and the preaching of Christ is probably not mercy but judgment; cp. 2 Peter ii. 4; Jude 6; cp. Bousset, "Zur Hadesfahrt Christi" (*Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 1919-20), SS. 56, 58. It has been suggested that Sheol is regarded as an intermediate state in Job xiv. 13-5, xix. 25-7. Charles finds that shortly after 200 B.C., the conception of Sheol as an intermediate state became the prevailing idea; cp. Charles, *Eschatology*, pp. 70 n. 2, 290 ff., 474; cp. *Enoch* vii. 1-3, xviii. 7. The Persians of the time of the Sassanides believed in a purgatory, which lay between the paradise of the just and the hell of the unjust. Into this purgatory went the souls of those whose good deeds exactly counterbalanced their sins. There these souls await the resurrection; cp. Huart, *La Perse antique*, p. 218.

If the dead continue to live, the question must naturally present itself, in what form do they continue to exist? Broadly speaking, two answers have been given to this question. On the one hand, the old body is conceived of as being resurrected from the grave, transformed, no doubt, but still in its substance the old body. On the other hand, the view has been set forth that a new kind of organ is needed for the new conditions, and hence the belief in the spiritual body.

In the Babylonian religion Bêl dies and goes to "the mountain" (the lower world).¹ According to the Aššur text, he prays there for his release,² and he is duly resurrected from the dead. This myth is obviously borrowed from the older cult of Tammuz, and the death and resurrection of Bêl was probably annual.³

In Egypt, the chief interest was rather in the future life than in resurrection *per se*. In the religion of Osiris, the chief god of the dead, the sprouting barley was regarded as the emblem of the god's resurrection.⁴ In the

¹ Cp. The Death and Resurrection of Bêl-Marduk (23), Langdon, *The Epic of Creation*, p. 39.

² Cp. Langdon, *op. cit.* p. 41 n. 9.

³ Cp. *ibid.* p. 50. One of the chief offices of the Sumerian Asari (perhaps the same as the Egyptian Osiris) was to raise the dead to life again; cp. Sayce, *The Archaeology of the Cuneiform Inscriptions*, p. 119.

⁴ Cp. "The story of his [Attis'] sufferings, death, and resurrection was interpreted as the ripe grain wounded by the reaper, buried in the granary, and coming to life again when it is sown in the ground" (Frazer *Golden Bough*, pt. iv., Adonis, Attis, Osiris, pp. 232, 322). It was customary to make figures of Osiris, embed corn-seeds in them, and then bury them. "The corn-god produced the corn from himself; he gave his own body to feed the people; he died that they might live" (Frazer, *op. cit.* p. 324); cp. Core and the grain springing again after being sown, as symbolic of human life after death (Foucart, *Les Mystères d'Eleusis*, p. 473). Frazer thinks that the Easter celebration of the death and resurrection of Christ was influenced by the similar celebration of the death and resurrection of Attis; cp. *Golden Bough*, pt. iv., Adonis, Attis, Osiris, p. 256; cp., however, Bousset, *Kyrios Christos*, S. 30; cp. the Coptic Book of the Resurrection found in Egypt, and attributed to Bartholomew. It describes the descent of Jesus into hell, His conquest of death, defeat of the devil, liberation of Adam and Eve, final condemnation of Judas, ascent from hell, resurrection, and enthronement on the right hand. Cp., as regards St. Paul's use of the grain, 1 Cor. xv. 36 ff.

great temple of Isis at Philæ, corn-stalks are represented as springing from the dead body of Osiris.

To the mind of Greece, bodily resurrection did not commend itself.¹ In Orphism there is no resurrection of the body, though Bacchus was held to die and rise again periodically, and his devotees, partaking of his sacred body, and assisting at his resurrection, may be regarded as sharing in his resurrection life.²

According to the sacred books of the ancient Persian religion, there will be a resurrection of the dead, good and bad alike, at the end of the present age. The agent of the resurrection will be a saviour, Soshyans, or Saoshyant. Mithras succeeded Soshyans as saviour.³

Mithraism taught at once the immortality of the individual soul and the bodily resurrection of the entire community. At the end of the world, the human body, as well as the soul, will share in the blessedness of the life to come.⁴

In the Old Testament there is hardly more than a suggestion of resurrection.⁵ A more certain note appears in the apocalyptic literature, where the faithful dead of past ages are to be resurrected, and have their part in the new earth, while the wicked are left in Sheol. Here, as in St. Paul's teaching, the real interest is in the destiny of the faithful restored to life again. In the apocalyptic literature, however, there is not one single unified conception of the resurrection. Three views are presented: (1) that all would rise again;⁶ (2) that only Israelites would rise;⁷ (3) that only the righteous in

¹ Cp. Acts xvii. 32.

² Cp. Farnell, *Greek Hero Cults and Ideas of Immortality*, pp. 375, 381.

³ Frazer, *The Worship of Nature* (Gifford Lecture), pp. 521, 529.

⁴ "C'est ici la personne humaine tout entière qui doit jouir de la vie éternelle"; cp. Cumont, *Les Religions orientales dans le paganisme romain*, p. 192.

⁵ Hosea vi. 1-2, xiii. 14; Isa. xxv. 8, xxvi. 19; Ezek. xxxvii. 1-14; Dan. xii. 2. There is a strong national note in the Jewish belief in resurrection. The hope was that Israel would be restored as a nation on its own soil.

⁶ Cp. *Test. XII. Patr.*; *Book of Adam and Eve*; *Apoc. of Baruch*.

⁷ Cp. *Ass. of Moses*; *Enoch* (part of).

Israel would rise.¹ The Jewish resurrection was primarily a bodily resurrection, but not necessarily permanently so. Baruch tells that the dead will eventually be transformed into the splendour of angels, who naturally do not have fleshly bodies. At the same time, there were schools of Jewish thought which taught, not only that the body would be resurrected, but that this body would be immortal. To those who could accept this view, the difficulty was ended. But, from a very early date, the obvious fact that the material body is destroyed through death is recognised, and the conviction is forced home to men's minds that the separation between soul and body is final. But, as the disembodied soul must have some sort of organon, the necessity arose to postulate some kind of spiritual or ethereal body resembling that in which man had lived on earth, but immaterial, and suited to his new conditions. It was a real source of anxiety lest the soul should find itself "naked" after physical death.² We find an echo of this anxiety in St. Paul's own case.³

The conception of a spiritual body to be possessed by the soul after death was held long before St. Paul's day. It originated perhaps in Egypt. The Pythagoreans held that the disembodied soul wanders in the air over the earth in the likeness of the body.⁴ In the

¹ Cp. 2 Macc. ; Enoch (§§ 4, 5).

² According to a doctrine of Chaldeo-Persian origin, the soul, after death, was gradually stripped in its ascent. To the moon it gave up its vital and alimentary force, to Mercury its greed, to Venus its amorous passions, to the sun its intellectual faculties, to Mars its passion for war, to Jupiter its ambitious aspirations, to Saturn its inclinations to sloth ; cp. Cumont, *After Life in Roman Paganism*, p. 107. By the time the eighth heaven was reached, the soul was completely stripped of all encumbrances.

³ Cp. 2 Cor. v. 3. When the spirit departs from the body at death, it loses, as it were, its clothing. The pneumatic body is the new garment provided. It is just like the naked corn put into the soil, and presently springing up in a rich garment of living green. The period of sleep after death, of which St. Paul speaks, is to be regarded as a period of incomplete clothedness. There is a remarkable saying from a papyrus roll. According to this, the disciples ask, "When wilt Thou be manifest to us, and when shall we see Thee ?" To this question, Jesus is reported to have answered, "When ye shall be stripped (*ὅταν ἐκδύσησθε*), and not be ashamed" ; cp. Milligan, *Here and There among the Papyri*, pp. 126-7.

⁴ Cp. Cornford, *Greek Religious Thought*.

astral religions, the souls, when they left the earth, were believed to be enveloped by a subtile fluid which retained the appearance of the persons who were formerly animated by these souls.¹ In the Mithraic liturgy, there is the idea of a heavenly body, which suggests St. Paul's pneumatic body.² In the Hermetic literature, while it is frankly recognised that the body dissolves after death, and the customary appearance vanishes, a man apparently is held to live on in a kind of spiritual body.³ There is thus precedent even for St. Paul's conception of the pneumatic body, although it must also be claimed that his presentation has features entirely its own, and commands our confidence in a way that these others never do.

The two main sources of St. Paul's conception of the resurrection are, as we should expect, Judaism and the Christian tradition originating in the teaching of Jesus Himself. It can hardly be over-emphasised that St. Paul's education in the days of his youth was Pharisaic. The belief in the resurrection was a cardinal doctrine of the Pharisees, tenaciously held by them even in opposition to its strenuous denial by a considerable body of the Jewish people. Nor can it be forgotten that, though Jesus Himself was not a Pharisee, He grew up in the same environment as St. Paul—the environment of Jewish apocalyptic beliefs. There is the same eschatological tradition behind the Gospels and the Pauline letters.⁴

An initial difficulty in estimating the influence of the teaching of Jesus on St. Paul as regards his eschatological outlook lies in this, that while we have, in the Pauline letters, a fairly precise statement of St. Paul's

¹ Cp. Cumont, *After Life in Roman Paganism*, p. 103.

² Cp. Reitzenstein, *Die Hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen*, S. 33.

³ Cp. Mead, *Thrice-Greatest Hermes*, ii. p. 41. Kennedy (*St. Paul and the Mystery Religions*, p. 180) points out that, as in the Mystery religions, so St. Paul combines *συμμορφιζόμενος* with *γινώσκειν* (Phil. iii. 10), and cites the case of the alchemist Zosimos, who "speaks of a priest who, in his vision, 'renewed' him (*καινούργιον με*), so that he became *πνεῦμα*." This process he describes later as *μετασωματούμενος*, i.e. exchanging body for spirit.

⁴ Cp. Mark xiii. and 2 Thess. ii.

views, we cannot always be certain that, in the Gospels as they now exist, we have an exact statement of what Jesus taught. The Gospels are later, have been compiled from older sources, and there is the possibility that something has crept in that was not in the original utterance of Jesus.¹

It is possible, we believe, nevertheless, to penetrate to the substance of what Jesus said. He took up the message of John the Baptist, the call to repentance, the threat of judgment, and the proclamation of the present and coming kingdom²—a message at once ethical, religious, and distinctively eschatological. He added the new note of the Father's love, readiness to forgive, and the call to reconciliation. Like St. Paul, Jesus refrains from using excessively the spectacular scenery of the Jewish apocalyptic literature. He regards the resurrection as an assured fact.³ He does not apparently teach that the soul possesses an inherent immortality; but that, inasmuch as God is the Living God, He is also the God of the living and not of the dead, and that those who are in living fellowship with Him now must remain in living fellowship with Him always. It is a repetition of the Old Testament view that, for those who are in communion with God here and now, it is inconceivable that death could mean any break. Both these ideas are also characteristic of St. Paul's teaching. To Jesus, the present life is the gift of God to His children. It is good to all who are His, and death is simply the

¹ Yet there is clearly the evidence of eschatology in the primal sources of the Gospels.

² Jesus, from the first, preached that the kingdom of God is present. As it became apparent to Him that His death was inevitable, while still preaching that the kingdom is here and now, He dwelt more and more on the thought that, only in the future, would the kingdom be completely consummated. Before that happened, there would be: (1) the Parousia, or Second Advent; (2) the Final Judgment; (3) the Resurrection. To have a part in the fully realised kingdom, men must receive the kingdom now present on earth. The kingdom embraces the righteous of all lands and all times, and will be eternal. It involves a life of solidarity with Christ the Head, and with all others who are in the kingdom.

³ Cp. Mark xii. 23.

doorway, not only to a continued, but to a far richer and fuller life. In the teaching of Jesus, there is no conclusive evidence for belief either in the intermediate state or in conditional immortality, nor can the single saying to the thief on the cross¹ be taken as decisive evidence that there is an immediate entrance into the full glory of the hereafter immediately following death.

What is certain is that He was sure in regard to His own resurrection,² accepted the current belief in a general resurrection, and was particularly interested in the resurrection of His own, the children of the kingdom. That kingdom was at once present and to come. That it was already begun during His earthly ministry was implied in His Messiahship. Wherever the Gospel was accepted by a human heart, there the kingdom was present.³

At the same time, the full realisation of the kingdom in all its glory of a renovated heaven and earth belongs to the afterwards. Jesus felt that His own death was to be a necessary step towards this. He was certain that He would return after death to complete His work begun on earth.⁴

If we accept as strictly authentic the Gospel intimations as to when the Parousia would occur, it is difficult to find a consistent view. Jesus would appear to intimate, at one time, His speedy Parousia,⁵ at another time to suggest delay,⁶ and at another, to disclaim all knowledge of the precise date of its occurrence.⁷ There is a similar

¹ Cp. Luke xxiii. 43. It is not at all clear what we are to understand by "paradise."

² Cp. Mark viii. 31, ix. 31, x. 34.

³ Cp. Mark ix. 1; Matt. xi. 11, xii. 28, xiii. 24 ff.

⁴ Cp. Mark viii. 38, xiii. 26, 27, xiv. 25, 62; Matt. xiii. 41-3, xvi. 27; Luke ix. 26, 27. The tradition held in the time of the Antonines, by orthodox and heretic alike, that Jesus spent many years on earth after the Resurrection, may be regarded as a later evidence to this certainty of Jesus; cp. *Pistis Sophia* (Horner's translation), p. xxiv. The writer of the *Pistis Sophia* shows an acquaintance with Platonic philosophy and with the Synoptic Gospels. He almost certainly lived in Alexandria, and was probably Valentinus (c. 135-160); cp. Horner, p. xxxviii.

⁵ Cp. Mark xiii. 30; Matt. xvi. 28; Luke xxi. 34-5.

⁶ Mark iv. 26-9; Matt. xxv. 19; Luke xii. 45.

⁷ Cp. Mark xiii. 32.

lack of rigid consistency in St. Paul's intimations in regard to the Parousia.

In any case, to Jesus, it is not the precise date of the Parousia that matters. It is the fact of the Parousia, as something that must inevitably occur, in accordance with the Divine purpose of God, and with a view to the final establishment of God's kingdom of righteousness, truth, and love, that Jesus would emphasise. It is a natural sequel to His earthly mission, His death, and resurrection, and is an inevitable stage in the furtherance of the Divine plan running through all history, and culminating in the final consummation of all things.

In contrasting the conceptions of Jesus and St. Paul as regards Christ's death and resurrection, it has always to be remembered that the latter stood further down in the sequence of events. What Jesus anticipated had become in the faith and, we add, the experience, of St. Paul, accomplished facts. The manner of Christ's death was known to St. Paul only through the evidence of eye-witnesses, and through the current tradition of the Christian community. It was otherwise with Christ's resurrection and risen life. His certainty in regard to these was founded on his own unquestioned experience of having seen the Risen Lord with his own eyes on the Damascus way. But then the resurrection of Christ might be an isolated event in the history of an exceptional being. We know that there actually were Christians who accepted the truth that Christ had risen, but were unable to find assurance that the Christian dead would also rise.¹ Once again, St. Paul could appeal to the certainty of personal experience. He was conscious that he was in mystical union with Christ, that it was the same Christ who had risen from the dead, and who was in fact the Holy Spirit, who was actively operating in himself, and that this new life of fellowship with Christ was the immortal life actually begun. The present quickening was the sure guarantee of the future and fuller quickening

¹ *e.g.* some of the Corinthian Christians (1 Cor. xv. 12 ff.).

after physical death.¹ The God and Father, who had raised Christ from the dead, would never permit those who were in mystical union with Him to see destruction. The mystical union was alike for time and eternity. The certainty of it was particularly vivid at the celebration of the Lord's Supper, when the communicants partook of the mystic body and the mystic blood of the Risen Lord ; but the mystical union was never broken. It was all-comprehensive. It meant sharing in Christ's life, His work, His sufferings, His death ; and it must have, as an inevitable sequence, resurrection and a glorified life in the spiritual body.

St. Paul's belief in the pneumatic body, the true resurrection body, must have gradually been evolved in his mind under several influences. He believed from the first without doubt in the existence of demons. But these demons, while most real, did not possess a fleshly body. He must have thought of them as having a kind of ethereal body. Then, to the Greek mind, the thought of a bodily resurrection was repugnant, and the conviction was strongly held that what survived was of the nature of an incorporeal shade. To St. Paul, the Greek conception must have appeared inadequate. It was too shadowy, lacked reality, and failed to satisfy the demand for continuity and identity. It was no more satisfactory than the gross conception of a merely bodily resurrection held by many of his countrymen.²

Yet, while both his conception of demons, and the Greek idea of the shades, must have influenced St. Paul, the main source of his conception of the pneumatic body to be fully realised in the hereafter of the saints, was the historic fact of Christ's appearance in such a body to St. Paul himself, and the conviction of his daily experience

¹ This experience of St. Paul is to be regarded as a further development of the Old Testament conviction that the fellowship with God begun on earth could not be destroyed by death.

² Weiss is right in saying, " So sehen wir Paulus in seiner Auferstehungslehre eine Mittelstellung einnehmen zwischen dem massiv-körperlichen Glauben des vulgären Judentums und der geistigeren Hoffnung hellenistischer Richtungen " ; cp. *Das Urchristentum*, S. 417.

that, being already in communion with the Holy Spirit, nothing, not even death, would ever separate him from that Spirit. The life to come must inevitably be a pneumatic life, and its organ, the body of the saint after death, must be a pneumatic, a spiritual body. Even now that body was in process of formation. That was an inevitable concomitant of the life here and now in the Spirit. But its complete realisation must come after physical death and the deliverance which death must bring. In the afterwards, it would be a completely emancipated body, secure from decay, and not subject to sensuality or any burden. Above all, it would be a body whose most salient characteristic is "glory" (δόξα).

By his enunciation of the spiritual body, St. Paul avoided at once the grossness and impossibilities of the Jewish bodily resurrection, and succeeded, where the Greek failed, in saving the entire personality of man, beyond the disruption of death.

In St. Paul's teaching, it must be noted that the spiritual body has to do only with the elect. As to what the state of the lost is, St. Paul leaves us with no very satisfactory answer. If we accept the evidence of Acts as giving words actually spoken by St. Paul, he clearly affirms "a resurrection both of the just and the unjust."¹ But as to how the latter are existing in the meantime, and as to what body they will appear in at the resurrection, there is no precise information.² It has been suggested that, in St. Paul's system, there are two resurrections: the first of the just, the second of the unjust; but there is no conclusive evidence for this view. One is on absolutely safe ground to say that St. Paul's main interest lies in the afterwards of the elect, that their resurrection to eternal life is certain, and that, at the resurrection, they will enter into the full glory of the life in the spiritual body.

¹ Cp. Acts xxiv. 15; 2 Cor. v. 10.

² Morgan holds the view that, in the teaching of St. Paul, "the wicked simply disappear from the scene, the nature and term of their punishment being left shrouded in obscurity"; cp. *The Religion and Theology of Paul*, p. 237.

When the belief in personal immortality, and resurrection in some kind of body, is accepted, there still remains the problem, What are the conditions of happiness, or misery, in which the survivors continue to exist, and upon what does the character of their state depend? Is the decision made on moral, or non-moral, grounds? To this, two answers have been made. One would affirm that the future state of the survivors depends entirely on initiation, or failure to secure initiation, in accordance with the ritual of some cult. This must be regarded as the more primitive conception. But the upward movement of human life is more and more towards the ethical, and hence we, in course of time, find another answer, namely, that final destiny is determined by personal morality and spiritual attainment. This second answer arose as a sequel to the growth of the ethical perception of conduct as being possessed of a certain moral value, demanding punishment or reward. Hence the idea of judgment, specially a day of judgment, for the resurrected, and conceptions of the final state of men personally, of humanity as a whole, and indeed of the entire system of things.

In the earliest belief and practice of Egypt, the conception of the afterwards of men was evidently purely material. Prehistoric graves in Egypt, as elsewhere, show evidences of careful provision of the clothing, food, and weapons necessary for the continuance of a life similar to that which the deceased lived above ground.¹

But Egypt, at a very early period in its long history, evolved a more exalted, more spiritual, conception of the state of the soul after death. According to Foucart, happiness in the hereafter did not depend, in the cult of

¹ In Babylonia, in early times, food and drink were provided in the graves of the dead. Later on, the custom seems to have been abandoned, though, on the other hand, ornaments increase, *e.g.* mirrors, earrings, necklaces, etc.; cp. Jastrow, *Religion of Babylonia and Assyria*, p. 600. For Egyptian graves, dating from at least 5000 B.C., and provided with food, cp. Moret et Davy, *Des Clans aux empires*, p. 139.

Isis, on the merit of the deceased, but upon whether the deceased had been duly initiated in accordance with the rites of Isis.¹ But there is abundant evidence of judgment apparently on moral grounds, Thot being the judge.² The dominant belief of Egypt was that future happiness was assured for all except the positively wicked, and, even for the wicked, the hope was held out, that, by passing through the necessary transmigrations, they might eventually attain to a better life.

In early Greece, as in prehistoric Egypt, we may be certain that the idea of judgment in the afterwards on ethical grounds did not emerge.³ Even in the Mystery religions, destiny in the afterwards is determined by initiation, or the lack of it, rather than on ethical grounds. Plato strongly condemns Orphism because it promises salvation as a reward for a merely ritualistic initiation.⁴ But Orphism has its merits. To it is due the belief in the day of judgment.⁵ To the Orphics also is due the association of retribution, or reward, with Hades.⁶ The Orphics were the first to separate, in the underworld, the two regions Tartarus and the Elysian Fields. They distinguished three classes : (1) the initiated, who dwelt in the blessedness of the Elysian Fields ; (2) the impure and uninitiated, who underwent punishment and purification in the underworld, and then returned to earth to become reincarnate ; (3) those who were condemned to eternal punishment.⁷ This last was not of the nature of

¹ Cp. Foucart, *Les Mystères d'Éleusis*, pp. 83 ff.

² Cp. Ball, *Light from the East*, p. 123. In the scene given by Ball we find the heart (Egyptian "ab") weighed against the ostrich feather (the hieroglyph for Truth and Right). According to Flinders Petrie, "probably the 'ba' (*i.e.* the man's soul) belongs to the oldest stratum, the 'ka' (*i.e.* the ancestral spirit) to the Osiris worshippers, and the 'aakhu' (*i.e.* the intelligence) to the followers of Ra"; cp. *Immortality* (Marchant), p. 2 ; cp. Moret et Davy, *Des Clans aux empires*, pp. 9-10, 167.

³ According to Rohde, even in the halcyon days of Greek culture, there is no conclusive evidence of belief in judgment in the afterwards on the present life ; cp. *Psyche*, i. S. 312.

⁴ Cp. *Republic*, ii. 364 C.

⁵ Cp. Cornford, *Greek Religious Thought*.

⁶ Cp. Cumont, *After Life in Roman Paganism*, p. 73 f.

⁷ Cp. *ibid.*, pp. 170, 172 ; cp. Rohde, *Psyche*, ii. S. 129.

eternal torture or pain, but rather unconsciousness or annihilation.¹

In keeping with Plato's condemnation, the acid test in Orphism must have remained whether or not there had been initiation. Even in the Eleusinian Mysteries, happiness in the beyond is the fate of the initiated, misery the destiny of the uninitiated,² though, from the fact that the Eleusinian Mysteries commended themselves to Plato, we may perhaps infer that he saw in them the beginnings of a higher ethical test. When Diogenes heard it said that only the initiated had blessedness in the hereafter, he asked, "What do you mean? Is Pataikion, the thief, going to have a 'better lot' after death than Epaminondas, just because he was initiated?"³ It was probably characteristic of the Greek spirit that it found no pleasure in the anticipation of the damnation even of the wicked.⁴

Originally, among the Romans, life in the afterwards was simply a continuation of the present life with all its salient features of social and personal distinctions. There was no suggestion of a day of final judgment. Seneca expresses the view that death is the great judgment day,⁵ though he is not always consistent in his view. When Rome became a world power, beliefs concerning judgment and the final state were appropriated from practically all the faiths of the diverse peoples under Roman rule who held these beliefs.

Mithraism carried its clearly defined conception of dualism, as running through all existence, into its portrayal of the last judgment and the final state of things. Yet it was felt that the long and bitter struggle between the antagonistic forces of good and evil could not continue for ever. A decisive settlement must be made. Before

¹ Cp. Farnell, *Greek Hero Cults and Ideas of Immortality*, pp. 382-3.

² Cp. Foucart, *Les Mystères d'Éleusis*, pp. 362-3.

³ Cp. Cornford, *Greek Religious Thought*.

⁴ Farnell points out the absence of reference to the punishment of the wicked on grave-inscriptions referring to immortality; cp. *Greek Hero Cults and Ideas of Immortality*, p. 399. Is the scanty reference of St. Paul to the fate of the wicked due to Greek influence?

⁵ Cp. *Epp.* xxvi. 4.

the final consummation, Mithras would appear upon the earth, and would determine the fate alike of the living and the dead, gathered together to receive his judgment.¹ Mithraism believed in the existence of three heavens as a last dwelling-place for the blessed.² When final judgment is pronounced by Mithras on all, Ahriman and his satellites will be utterly destroyed by fire.³

In the Hermetic literature, the pious soul is conceived of as being reunited with Deity, and living and reigning with Him for ever. This idea, according to Reitzenstein, is Egyptian in its origin.⁴ The greatest punishment for the sinful soul is the "lack of piety" itself.⁵ Punishment is thus conceived of in a purely ethical sense. The impious soul is depicted as "chastised by its own self, and seeking for an earthy body wherein to enter, if only it be human."⁶ "Twixt heaven and earth, upon the waves of cosmos, it (the sinful soul) is dragged in contrary directions, for ever racked with ceaseless pains."⁷

In Judaism, from the first, there is a strong sense of the undeviating justice of Almighty God. But, in the older prophets and in the Mosaic code, the judgment of God is solely in the sphere of this present world. There is no evidence of a clear conception of judgment in the world to come. Later on, men had to change their view. Political and social oppression led the teachers of Judaism to recognise that, in this life alone, there is no adequate apportioning either of punishment or reward. Hence

¹ Cp. Cumont, *Les Mystères de Mithra*, pp. 6, 148; cp. *Les Religions orientales dans le paganisme romain*, p. 192.

² Cp. Scheffelowitz, "Der Seelen- und Unsterblichkeitsglaube im Alten Testament" (*Archiv für Religionswissenschaft*, Bd. xix. Hefte 2-3), S. 217. The first of these heavens was the star-world, the second the moon-world, the third the sun-world. There was a fourth, the dwelling of Ahuramazda.

³ Seneca quotes Berosus, showing that the belief that the world would be destroyed by fire was held by the Babylonians. It is probable that this belief influenced Hebrew thought; cp. Mic. i. 4; Nah. i. 5; Ps. xcvi. 5, civ. 32; cp. Rogers; *Cuneiform Parallels to the Old Testament*, p. 112.

⁴ Cp. *Poimandres*, SS. 67-8.

⁵ Cp. The Key of Thrice-Greatest Hermes, § 20.

⁶ Cp. *ibid.*, § 19.

⁷ Cp. The Perfect Sermon, § 2.

they were driven to look to a future life for these. This led to a cleavage between the older orthodox view and the new teaching of the rabbis. This cleavage was carried on into New Testament times, in the teaching of the two sects, the Sadducees and the Pharisees. Rabbinical or Pharisaic Judaism taught that there would be a resurrection, divine judgment, and eternal bliss, or eternal torment, according as men have been judged pious or impious. It is characteristic of the Jewish sense of justice that it demanded that there should be punishment for the sinful body as well as for the sinful soul. In this respect the Jewish view differed from the Greek and Egyptian.

The pious Jew believed that God would never abandon His own, not even in death.¹ It was because of this that death was robbed of its terrors, that men were prepared to die readily for their faith.²

As regards the fate of the wicked, there is nowhere, in the Old Testament, any evidence of a hell as a place of punishment. The wicked are "cut off from Israel."³ But this is not to be understood as absolute annihilation, or as eternal punishment. Death is the portion of the wicked.⁴ There is only one passage which definitely says that the wicked awake "to shame and everlasting contempt."⁵ It cannot be said that there is much in the Old Testament in regard to the ultimate fate of the unjust, nor is it all clear.

To Jesus Christ, the Last Judgment was an undoubted certainty.⁶ It would apply to all,⁷ would be according to deeds,⁸ and every secret would be revealed. Sometimes, it is God who is represented as the Judge,⁹

¹ Cp. Hosea xiii. 14; Job xix. 25-7; Ps. xlix. 15 ff.; Prov. xv. 24; Ezek. iii. 21, xviii. 5-9, 14-20.

² Cp. Jer. xi. 19-21, xxvi. 14.

³ Cp. Gen. xvii. 14; Exod. xii. 15, 19, xxx. 33, 38, xxxi. 14.

⁴ Cp. Ezek. iii. 18 ff., xviii. 13, xxxiii. 8-10.

⁵ Cp. Dan. xii. 1-3.

⁶ Cp. Matt. xii. 41 ff.

⁷ Cp. Matt. xiii. 41-3, xvi. 27, xxii. 11-14, xxv. 40.

⁸ Cp. Matt. xi. 20-4, xii. 41-2, xiii. 29, xix. 28, xxv. 14-30, 37-8; Mark ix. 41; Luke xi. 31-2, xix. 22-3.

⁹ Cp. Matt. x. 32, 33, xviii. 35.

and, sometimes, it is Jesus Himself.¹ The good² and evil will each receive their appropriate reward and punishment. The fate of the latter is absolutely clear. It is "hell," "eternal punishment," "cast forth into the outer darkness."³ The teaching of Jesus in this respect is both fuller and more explicit than that of St. Paul.

The thought of judgment was ever present to the mind of St. Paul, even though he was certain that he had entered into the new life with Christ. There was the possibility, even for him, of falling away, and, in any case, the life of those who had found Christ could never be an absolutely perfect life in this world. All must appear before the judgment-seat of Christ, even believers.⁴ St. Paul's "Day of the Lord" is to be understood as a period of time. It was wider than the last judgment. An act of judgment was felt by St. Paul to be the initial step in the destruction of the old world, and for the establishment of the new. It had to be all-embracing, and applied to Jew and Gentile, dead and living, good and evil, and dealt directly with the individual as such.

In the afterwards the Christian will dwell for ever with Christ in the fullness of the glorified life. Neither death nor judgment can ever separate the Christian from His Lord, who lives in him even here and now. But the eternal fellowship of the Christian with Christ is altogether different from the identification of the initiate with his god as in the Mystery religions. The Christian life of the hereafter is a life "face to face," a life where we shall "know" even as also we "have been known";⁵ a life of fellowship, wherein, stripped of all the humiliating burdens of the mortal flesh, the saints

¹ Cp. Matt. vii. 23, xvi. 27, xxv. 31-46.

² Cp. Mark x. 40 ff.; Matt. x. 42; Luke xvi. 19-31.

³ Cp. Mark ix. 47; Matt. viii. 12, xxv. 46; cp. Matt. xii. 32. Passages like Matt. v. 26 and Luke xii. 47-8 have been cited as indications of a limited punishment, but they do not bear out this interpretation.

⁴ Cp. 1 Cor. i. 8, iii. 13 ff.; 2 Cor. v. 10; Rom. xiv. 10.

⁵ Cp. 1 Cor. xiii. 12.

will be clothed with spiritual bodies similar to "the body of His glory."¹

St. Paul is so greatly absorbed in the thought of the glory of the final state of those who are in Christ Jesus, that he gives us little information as to the destiny of the impenitent sinners. His most expressive description of their fate is represented in the word "destruction" (ἀπώλεια).² The word may mean "elimination as personal beings";³ but it is best to understand the use of the word in a religious sense. It does not, for example, necessarily imply loss of consciousness, but it does mean separation from God. The punishment is regarded as eternal.⁴

In his great work on *Eschatology*, Dr. Charles has said: "Thus the Pauline eschatology points obviously, in its ultimate issues, either to the final redemption of all created personal beings,⁵ or—and this seems the true alternative—to the destruction of the finally impenitent. But this destruction would not be of the nature of an external punishment, but subjective and self-executed."⁶ With this conclusion we cannot agree. We find ἀπώλεια in Philippians iii. 19, *i.e.* belonging to St. Paul's fourth period, according to Dr. Charles. Its meaning there can only be that which is given above. St. Paul does not teach conditional immortality. He does not agree with the Mithraistic teaching in regard to the final state of all things. He does not teach the annihilation even of the finally impenitent, any more than he teaches the final redemption of all men. It must not be forgotten that St. Paul was perfectly clear and perfectly well informed

¹ Cp. Phil. iii. 21.

² Cp. Rom. ix. 22; Phil. i. 28, iii. 19; 1 Tim. vi. 9. Other words used are: ὀλεθρος; cp. 1 Thess v. 3; 2 Thess. i. 9; 1 Tim. vi. 9. ὀργή; cp. 1 Thess. i. 10, v. 9; Rom. v. 9, ix. 22; Eph. v. 6; Col. iii. 6. φθορά; cp. Gal. vi. 8.

³ Cp. Macintyre, *Immortality* (Marchant), p. 98.

⁴ Cp. 2 Thess. i. 9.

⁵ Charles would find, in Rom. xi., evidence for the view that St. Paul anticipated the conversion of the entire world, Jew and Gentile alike, before the Parousia; cp. *Eschatology*, p. 456.

⁶ Cp. Charles, *Eschatology*, p. 463.

as regards the teaching of his Master concerning these matters,¹ and that his Master's utterances were yea and amen to him. Nor is this meaning of St. Paul's words as regards the wicked necessarily a contradiction of his general statement that God will finally be "all in all." The very fate of the wicked, eternally separated from God, and incapable of doing harm, brings out in clearer light the final undisputed sovereignty of God.

What St. Paul is at once certain of, and perfectly clear about, is that those who are in Christ Jesus in this present life will be for ever in His fellowship in the hereafter, and that in the end all operative powers of evil will be destroyed, and everything made subject to Christ, "that God may be all in all."²

¹ Eternal damnation is, according to Charles, "a Judaistic survival"; cp. *Eschatology*, p. 367. In Jesus' teaching, the wicked are cast down into Gehenna, driven into "the outer darkness"; cp. Matt. v. 29, 30, viii. 12, x. 28; Mark ix. 43, 44, 47, 48.

² Cp. 1 Cor. xv. 24 ff.; Rom. viii. 19 ff.; Eph. i. 10, 23.

CHAPTER IX

ST. PAUL AND THE MODERN MIND

ST. PAUL is one of the great figures in history, about whom questions have always been, and are always likely to be, asked, by the student of religious life and thought. What was his real significance for his own generation, for the Church since his time, for present-day religious life, and for the faith of the men of to-morrow? Was he understood by his contemporaries? Has he been understood by the Church throughout its history? Is he understood by the Church of to-day? Is the best way of understanding him to attempt to set forth in elaborate form a system which we shall call "Paulinism"? Was he a syncretist and nothing more? Was he, unto the last, just a Jew with a veneer of Christianity? ¹ Was he merely an exponent of Christ and His teaching? Did he make an original contribution to the religious life of humanity? Is his teaching not only new, but entirely his own? Is it a living force in the religious movements of to-day? Did he even discover the secret of the one satisfactory life here, and the one manner of life which can afford any hope of security in the hereafter? Is the only hope of finding redemption that humanity should make this man, this apostle of Jesus Christ, its premier leader and guide?

These are not only serious questions and hard to

¹ One thinks of Disraeli. His father and mother were members of the Church of England. He himself received baptism from that Church. Yet, on his death-bed, his words were: "There is—one God—of Israel."

answer satisfactorily ; but upon their answer depend the most vital interests of the human race.

In starting out to make an attempt to reply to these questions, we would, for the sake of clearness, at once affirm that it is not so much an elaborated system of theology that St. Paul gives us, as rather a life—a new, eternal, and all-sufficient dynamic of spiritual life. We would equally affirm that, in St. Paul's presentation of Christianity, we have at once a syncretism, and, not forgetting that he was an apostle of Jesus Christ, at the same time the most original, and by far the most important, contribution to the religious life of humanity.

That primitive Christianity as a whole, and Pauline Christianity in particular, were, from one point of view, syncretisms, must be obvious to any serious student of their origin. Every great religion, even the greatest, must be a syncretism and something more, and the greatness of any religion will be measured by the thoroughness with which it gathers up into a unified whole the best in the religious environment, and by the spiritual and moral value of the something more that it adds straight from the heart of God.

In making this assertion there is no irreverence, no denial of the special revelation of God to His people—rather the opposite. To attempt to tear oneself out of the world, to try to break away from the continuous stream of historical life, is to tear oneself out of God's world, to separate oneself from that history,¹ which ultimately can be explained only as an evolution of the purpose of God. To attempt to divorce ourselves from the real spiritual life either of the past or the present is to divorce oneself from the life of God. The sin committed alike against historical truth and the scientific spirit, a sin of which certain branches of the Church are particularly, and, it is to be feared, increasingly guilty, has been to tear away

¹ " Any new religious teacher could not fail to be, to a great extent, a creature of his environment and of the age in which he was born "; cp. Hobley, *Bantu Beliefs and Magic*, pp. 19-20.

Christianity, as regards its origin and nature, from its natural environment, to explain it wrongly and mechanically as an altogether unique phenomenon, instead of showing it to be the highest manifestation of the religious life, the crowning revelation of God to man, and also, from the first, a religious life and revelation amid a larger genuine religious life and revelation, without which it could never be understood or explained.¹ The grudging and mean spirit in which this sin has originated is itself not merely alien to Christianity, but antichristian.

Christianity was syncretistic from the first. It did indeed claim to be independent, and to be the absolute religion. Its syncretism was in large measure unconscious, but none the less real. Modern scholarship has traced back, step by step, the formative influence of Hellenism, indeed of something bigger than Hellenism, on Christianity, from the first. We can now discern the syncretistic elements in its origin in a way of which the primitive Christian himself was not cognisant.² Take even the conviction that the kingdom of God was at hand. Jesus did not originate this. It was the belief of John the Baptist, who preceded Him. It was in the air. What Jesus did was to convince His followers that the kingdom *was* at hand, and to make them feel that, through Him, they already had a part in that kingdom, so that even His death did not take away their faith. Judaism as such was an inherent part of the syncretism of Christianity. Judaism could, and did, break away from Christianity.

¹ Charles, while admitting that, in the New Testament, "we find ourselves in an absolutely new atmosphere," goes on to say: "It is not that we have to do with a wholly new world of ideas and moral forces, for all that was great and inspiring in the past has come over into the present and claimed its part in the formation of the Christian Church"; cp. *Eschatology*, p. 362.

² "Das Christentum die Erbin der antiken Kultur." "Wenn auch unter heftigem Widerstreben, musste doch anerkannt werden, dass auch jene Urform des Christentums kein übergeschichtlich-sakrosankter Bezirk, kein rein autochthon-biblisches Gewächs ist, sondern ein Produkt jener wunderbaren Übergangszeit, für die wir kurzerhand die Bezeichnung 'Synkretismus' wählen." Cp. Weiss, "Das Problem der Entstehung des Christentums (*Archiv für Religionswissenschaft*, Bd. xvi., 1913), S. 425.

But Christianity could not break away from Judaism, because it had to keep a hold of the Old Testament. The genetic connection between the Old Testament and the New was instinctively recognised by Christianity. Marcion, who made the attempt to separate Christianity from Judaism, signally failed. He did not appreciate the inherent syncretistic nature of Christianity. The Gentile Church became the true successor of the broader Judaism of the Diaspora ; but it could only succeed in that rôle by firm adherence to the Judaistic factor in its genesis. Christianity was a syncretism from the first. It is a syncretism still. Otherwise, it would cease to be a living exponent of the Spirit of God, the Spirit of progressive revelation. Otherwise, it could scarcely continue to be a living force in the progressive movement of human life. Consciously, and perhaps even more unconsciously, it is continually appropriating new truth. We need cite only one illustration of this. In the margin of the Authorised Version, the date of creation, according to Archbishop Usher, is 4004 B.C. ; according to Professor Jeans, the date when the world was thrown out was some two thousand million years ago.¹ Some such view as the latter must now be accepted by the modern educated Christian.

What is true of primitive Christianity as a whole is particularly true of St. Paul and his presentation of Christianity. Of all the Christian writers of that age, he was the man of broadest and most intelligent outlook. None of them understood the times so well as he did. His letters show this, and the speeches reported in Acts as having been delivered by him are remarkably appropriate for the time and environment in which, as it is claimed, they were spoken. Unless he had been in a singular degree a man in intimate and interested touch with his times, understanding its yearnings and needs, its moral and spiritual sublimities and abysses, its spiritual success

¹ For other estimates of the age of the earth, all of them enormously large, cp. MacCurdy, *Human Origins*, i. p. 28.

and failure, he could neither have exercised so conspicuous an influence in his own day, nor would he be the great religious authority which he continues to be in our time. He is a salient example of the truth that to influence your world you must be in vital and sympathetic touch with it.

The Christianity of St. Paul was a syncretism, a gathering up and harmonising of all that was good and true in the existing spiritual and moral life of the world with which he came into living contact. It was a syncretism of Judaism, Paganism, and distinctive Christian teaching, including the lessons of the unique life and personality of Jesus, and the Christian traditions floating in the stream of primitive Christian life, in part known to St. Paul before his conversion, and, in richer measure, appropriated by him after that dramatic occurrence. We may be certain even that he was in measure fully conscious of this. He frankly acknowledged his debt alike to Jew and Gentile. If the Christianity of St. Paul had not been an exceptionally rich and comprehensive syncretism, it is inconceivable that it could have made its way as it did in the multi-coloured and many-sided world of his missionary successes, and equally incomprehensible that it should have commended itself to the even larger life of to-day. There are many modern Christians who cannot justly be accused of narrow-mindedness, who would readily make the claim for Christianity that it is the ideal religion, the one religion that adequately meets all needs of the human soul: yet these are the very Christians who would gratefully acknowledge contributions to Christianity, and to the richer understanding of the genius of Christianity, from all sources of legitimate truth. One can see little prospect before a narrow-minded and bigoted type of Christianity, that kind of Christianity which is more ecclesiastical than Christian.

Yet, while frankly recognising that the Christianity of St. Paul is a syncretism, it would be entirely erroneous to

say that it was merely a syncretism, even while judging it to be the greatest of syncretisms. It is something far more than the synthetic fusion of eclectic factors in the religious and moral life of the paganism and Judaism of his day. It is not merely the gathered and combined lights of the world of the first half of the first century of our Christian era. It is a mighty flood of radiant light straight from the heart of the sun. St. Paul, the syncretist, is, after Christ, the world's greatest religious genius. He presented to the world the new and larger revelation of the Father which had come to him through Him whom we honour as the Son.

Every man who is in direct touch with the Spirit of God can give a new and signal contribution to the religious life. Of all mere men, St. Paul has given the richest contribution, because of his singular endowments of heart and head, because of the remarkable experience which he had of the world of men, and because he, perhaps more than any man, entered into the Holy of Holies of God's own Presence. The most valuable part of his original contribution does not consist so much in doctrines that can be formally expressed as rather in its living dynamic. The secret of St. Paul's originality lies in the reality of his mystical life with God through Jesus Christ. This is the most vital and valuable factor in his Christianity. Merely tracing back ideas of St. Paul to some pagan or Jewish source, even if this were always possible, would leave the real significance of St. Paul unexplained. The syncretistic pagan and Jewish factors must be duly recognised and their importance justly estimated; but it is St. Paul himself, St. Paul the man of the mystical life with God in Jesus Christ, St. Paul the religious genius, who is the true key to the understanding of his Christianity.¹

Even the originality of Jesus does not lie so much in

¹ Cp. Dobschütz, "Religionsgeschichtliche Parallelen zum N.T." (*Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, Bd. xxi., 1922), S. 283.

novel doctrines that He taught, as rather in His spiritual authority, which derived its force from immediate and conscious communion with His Father. The man of genius, in religion, as in other spheres, has to use the current language, and to some extent the current ideas. What he does is to give to these words a new and richer meaning, to these ideas a richer, more comprehensive, more original interpretation and application. In his hands both are employed to set forth a new principle or truth of the soul, of the religious and ethical life, which has awakened to vivid reality in his own most real, because inner, experience.

Christians of all ages have accepted, with reverence, Jesus Christ as the Son of God. But, looked at from the human, the historical, point of view, it is showing no disrespect to Him to say that He was the world's greatest man of genius in the sphere of religion. Next to Him in this respect stands St. Paul. Whatever view we may take of the relationship of these two—whether, with Wrede,¹ we regard St. Paul's teaching as quite independent of Jesus, something new and entirely his own, or, with Weiss,² conceive of St. Paul as simply an interpreter and exponent of Jesus' teaching, at one with Him in matter and in feeling, and inspired entirely by His Spirit, of both we can unhesitatingly affirm that they were geniuses of the religious life, the greatest that the world has ever seen. The secret of that genius in each case is to be found in the inner life with God and in God. Of any man it is true that, to get a right understanding of that man, you must penetrate beyond his mere words, behind his external activities, into the innermost life of his soul. Of the man of genius in the sphere of religion this is true in a very special degree.

¹ Cp. Wrede, *Paulus* (Religionsgeschichtliche Volksbücher).

² Cp. Weiss, *Paulus u. Jesus*. Holtzmann thinks that the real originality of St. Paul is that he proclaims the universal human kernel of Jesus' teaching. Cp. *Neut. Theol.* ii. S. 243. His originality, however, lies deeper than that. It is to be found in this, that he shared in the same living communion with God, if in a lesser degree, which was an unfailling characteristic of the life of Jesus.

Without attempting to define too precisely St. Paul's indebtedness to Jesus as regards his own inner spiritual life, we must at least affirm that indebtedness. Without Jesus first, there could have been no St. Paul. Broadly speaking, something of this kind happened : St. Paul derived the actual facts in regard to the historical Jesus from the members of the Jewish Christian Church, partly at the time when he was antagonistic to that Church, and partly after his conversion. At the same time, he obtained from the same source a knowledge of the chief doctrines and beliefs associated with, or deducible from, these facts in a more or less crude and rudimentary form, and, through his own genius, and under the living inspiration of the Holy Spirit, he perfected these beliefs and doctrines, giving to them at once a wider and more profound interpretation and application. In short, he became the author and exponent of the Jesus-Christ cult.

To understand St. Paul, we must recognise that he was not merely a seeker after knowledge, after religious knowledge, not merely a student of human life, though he was that in a singular degree, but a man quivering with the life of God in his own heart,¹ a man who intuitively discerned the reality, the power, of God ; a man whose universe was " soaked through and through by the Presence of God " ;² a man to whom the only real and true is God ; a man to whom God, the Spirit of God, was, like the atmosphere, all round him, and in him, touching him at every point ; a man who confidently expected the Parousia of the triumphant Christ in His real presence, in power and great glory, but who, at the same time, was absolutely certain of the Parousia of the ever-present Spirit of God.

It is in the light of these things that St. Paul must be understood, to be understood at all, not by trying to portray him straight away as a sacramentarian, a

¹ St. Paul's religion gripped his whole life. Wernle's description is inadequate when he says of St. Paul that he " transferred the real life of religion to the feelings, discovered it in the feelings " ; cp. *Beginnings of Christianity*, i. p. 355.

² Cp. Underhill, *The Mystic Way*, p. 194.

philosopher, or even a theologian. It is by realising in our own life the central experience of his life in the Holy Spirit, who is Jesus Christ the Risen Lord,¹ that we are in a position to begin to understand this great man, and a most valuable factor in this is that we can, out of our own experience, test and prove the reality of St. Paul's whole position.

The first thing to do is to find the key to the understanding of St. Paul, and not only to discover that there was an inner life in the Spirit in St. Paul's own case, but to have that inner experience ourselves. To attempt to give a system of Paulinism or Pauline philosophy otherwise is like trying to read Hebrew without first mastering the alphabet, or like trying to understand Great Britain and the British people by simply sailing round the island, and noting the chief points in the configuration of the coast-line. The bulk of what is called "Paulinism" in modern theological writings has value only as a supplement or adjunct. The initial and altogether vital step is to realise the reality of St. Paul's life in the Holy Spirit, that life in him and in ourselves. Without this to begin with, and this all through, our investigation, "Paulinism" can at best be but a dead letter. The man who attempts to explain St. Paul without an inner experience of life in the Holy Spirit similar to his, must remain to the end a rank outsider. If this is understood and kept in mind throughout, it is quite legitimate to discover a Pauline philosophy,² apologetic, and theology, inasmuch as a real

¹ It is a very happy phrase of Deissmann when he says, "Paul is not so much the great Christologos as the great Christophoros"; cp. *The Religion of Jesus and the Faith of Paul*, p. 189.

² Wernle says, "The apostle Paul would have nothing to do with philosophy," and, "For St. Paul the word 'philosophy' denoted a bad, an ungodlike form of science, and such was the opinion of all Christians for a long time to come." While there is truth in these statements when we think of contemporary philosophy, it is none the less true that there is a philosophical background to St. Paul's teaching, and that he was debtor to the world of his age for his philosophical groundwork; cp. Wernle, *Beginnings of Christianity*, ii. pp. 140, 164. "Aber auch der Geist griechischer Philosophie ist der paulinischen Grundanschauung-ganz im allgemein geurteilt-durchaus fremd, ja diametral entgegengesetzt"; cp. Bousset, *Kyrios Christos*, S. 136.

religious life must imply a certain philosophical and theological basis, just as an efficient human body must have its osseous framework.

St. Paul was admittedly not a philosopher in the Greek sense of the word. Greek philosophy aimed at securing a clear and satisfactory cosmic knowledge. St. Paul, on the other hand, was mainly interested in the well-being of the human soul and in the establishment of a right relationship with God. St. Paul did not have the academic training of the Greek philosopher. It was not Greek philosophy that his hearers wanted. They would, as a rule, not have been able to understand it, even supposing St. Paul had been able to give it to them. The first conditions of successful teaching and preaching are to deliver a message which your hearers really need, and which they are capable of understanding.

St. Paul presents a definite Christian gnosis, in accordance with which Christ is the source, the centre, and the explanation of the cosmos. This gnosis presupposes faith, and is yet higher than faith. The world cannot understand it and regards it as folly, *e.g.* the Cross. It is the gift of the Pneuma, the Holy Ghost, and is found only in those who possess the Spirit. It is for this reason that the world cannot understand it. It is not only transcendently higher than all merely human knowledge, but radically different from it, because, whereas human knowledge has its origin in human reason, Christian gnosis is due to the illumination of the Spirit. The divine knowledge is always true, whereas human knowledge is true only in so far as it agrees with divine gnosis. Merely human knowledge can never enable a man to lay hold of the divine gnosis. It is those who have obtained the divine knowledge who alone are able to understand the deep things of God. Even to understand those who possess the divine gnosis, you must yourself be in possession of it. Through the active indwelling of the Holy Spirit, the redeemed man obtains a new noölogical method. In himself he is a mere atom ;

but, by sharing in the life of the Holy Spirit, he enters into conscious and intelligent communion with the greatest spiritual reality.

St. Paul may be regarded as the greatest of all gnostics—not, however, in the pagan, but in the Christian sense.¹ Pagan gnosis was only “an illegitimate child of the Mystery religions.”² St. Paul instinctively recognised its true character, and opposed it tooth and nail in the two Corinthian letters. In their origin, development, and goal the two types of gnosis are radically opposed. St. Paul’s gnosis rests on definite historical facts. Its chief and central object is the Cross of Jesus. His gnosis is entirely the free gift of God, so that all that boasting, characteristic of pagan gnosis, is impossible. Conscious, in its possession, of sublime strength, St. Paul nevertheless gloried in his human weakness and affliction. What a gulf of separation there is between this attitude and that of the pagan gnostic, who regarded all human weakness as associated with a low type of religious life, and therefore a thing to be contemptuously cast aside! Behind St. Paul, even though he was not a philosopher in the strict sense of the word, there is a philosophical background, and a clearly articulated philosophy of history, which can still be defended.³

In St. Paul’s teaching we find a threefold apologetic :

¹ Cp. Reitzenstein, *Die Hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen*, S. 56 ; cp. Wernle, *Beginnings of Christianity*, ii. p. 191.

² Cp. Lake, *The Stewardship of Faith*, p. 123.

³ Even if we reject the story of Adam and Eve as unhistorical, even if we doubt, though there is no good reason for so doing, the authenticity of the recorded life of Moses, St. Paul’s conception of the philosophy of history does not have its foundations swept away. Human life had a beginning somewhere and somehow. There was a long period during which the human mind and conscience did not rise to the conception of a fully articulated moral law (e.g. like the law of Moses). There was in the history of Israel, and it can be paralleled in other nations, the period when, by obedience to such a moral law as people had, it was thought possible to please the Deity and to obtain the reward of His favour (this applied specially to the nation as a whole, but also in measure to the individual). And there came the time of the new age which originated in the uniquely original conception of the Divine Son of the God of all the Universe come to earth, incarnate in human flesh, and the life of the Spirit of God consciously present in the human heart.

(1) an apologetic, by which he vindicates the claims of the One Living and True God, as over against pagan idolatry ; (2) an apologetic, defending the undoubted claims of Jesus Christ, the true Messiah sent of God for the deliverance of His people, Christ Pre-existent, Incarnate, Crucified, Risen, Exalted, Present as the Holy Spirit, as over against the Judaisers ; (3) an apologetic, maintaining the mystical union with the Holy Spirit, as over against the erroneous mysticism of the pagan religions.

A definite theological system can also be framed from his teaching. This must be the case, inasmuch as any personal religion must ever seek to justify its reality in the environment of world experience, and specially in that field of experience which is guided and inspired by reason. Any attempt to give a reasoned account of our personal religion, even to our own selves, must lead to the construction of a system of theology. The stronger reason is operative in a man, the greater will be the demand for a theology as the rational interpretation and presentation of the basis of our personal religious life.

St. Paul was a markedly strong man, judged alike from the religious and the rational point of view. At the same time, his message is, in the first instance, essentially religious. His cult is the Christ-cult. It is the mystery faith of Jesus Christ, Son of God, Incarnate, Crucified, Risen, Exalted, Present in the Holy Spirit. The Christian Kyrios is historical. He is the Jesus who died and rose again, the Jesus intimately associated with Jerusalem. He is more than a pagan Soter. He is the Soter with Divine power. At the end of the world, which is at hand, He will save His own at the bar of judgment.¹

St. Paul's doctrine is the doctrine of saving life and saving faith which originate simultaneously in the hearts

¹ Modern Christianity has no call to abandon its faith in the coming Parousia. If St. Paul was mistaken, it was only in regard to the nearness of its approach.

of the elect. It declares deliverance from the tyranny of the Law and the bondage of the flesh, in the new freedom of life in the Spirit. It proclaims forgiveness, grace, and confidence of coming glory. All these things are, without depreciating the value of individual effort, ultimately the free gifts of God.

In keeping with his doctrine presented in his extant writings was his preaching. Its foundation and inspiration was life in the Spirit, a living faith and a personal religious experience which he knew to be real. He preached Christ, because Christ was already in him. His preaching has the note of absolute sincerity, fearlessness in utterance, unswerving devotion, the spirit of personal modesty combined with well-justified confidence, a genuine sympathy with and understanding of his hearers,¹ the conviction that his gospel was alone the true gospel because it was the gospel of Jesus Christ, and that all other so-called gospels were the fakes of demons. It would be well for the modern preacher if he had more alike of the substance and the spirit of St. Paul's preaching. And yet, with all his gifts and qualifications, St. Paul has been, and is still, a man greatly misunderstood. His own countrymen did not understand him during his lifetime, and of him, as of Christianity as a whole, it must be acknowledged that there has been signal failure to obtain root in Semitic soil. It is in the Gentile world that we must seek for evidence of the undoubted influence of this great man.² St. Paul not only had to recognise the failure of many of his countrymen to understand him, but also the failure of the Gentile Church to understand many elements in the Jewish Church. It is probable that this was the

¹ How intimately St. Paul was in touch with the lower classes is shown by his using the phrases which were in common use in worship and in the market-place, and giving these a Christian meaning; cp. Deissmann, *Light from the Ancient East*, pp. 316 ff., 332 ff.

² Glover says of him, that he is "the man to whom the Church owes its universal reach and unity, its theology, and the best of the language in which it has expressed its love for his Master"; cp. *The Conflict of Religion*, p. 155.

reason why St. Paul does not use the title " Son of Man " as applied to Christ, a title which played so important a part in the primitive Jewish Church. The Gentile communities would not understand it. On the other hand, St. Paul's use of the title " Kyrios " was probably due to his desire to make his presentation of Christianity understandable to the Gentile hearers.¹

Yet, in spite of all his efforts, St. Paul was greatly misunderstood even by the Gentile Church of his own day. This may, in part, have been due to the fact that he did not originate all the Gentile communities ; but it was in far greater measure due to their composition, to the vast diversity and complexity of ideas and practices which the members had brought with them into the Christian Church. His own letters afford ample evidence of the measure in which he was misunderstood, and the misunderstanding continued long after his day.²

A great deal of the misunderstanding of St. Paul, alike in his own day, in the history of the Church, and at the present time, is due to a misinterpretation of what he means by faith.

The conception of faith was nothing new. It had already had a long history in pre-Pauline days.³ But

¹ In keeping with this was St. Paul's appeal to the tradition of Antioch rather than to that of Jerusalem. " Wo aber der Apostel sich so auf die Tradition beruft, da ist es eben nach allem Ausgeführten nicht die Tradition von Jerusalem, sondern Zunächst die der heidenchristlichen Gemeinde in Antiochia, indirect erst der jerusalemischen Gemeinde " ; cp. Bousset, *Kyrios Christos*, S. 93.

² Foakes-Jackson says, " In the early Church the writings of Paul were more admired than understood " ; cp. *Studies in the Life of the Early Church*, p. 75. Harnack holds the view that Marcion was the only Christian of the second century who understood St. Paul.

³ As a principle of the religious life, it did not have a place in the pagan State worship. But we can trace its evolution in the Old Testament. The earliest example of trusting in Yahweh is probably found in Gen. xv. 1-6 ; cp. other early examples, Isa. vii. 9, xxviii. 16 ; Ps. lxxviii. 21 ff. ; Hab. ii. 4 (Rom. i. 17 ; Gal. iii. 11). It is implied in the use of the word קָנָה (" to look for "), cp. Isa. viii. 16 ff., li. 5 ; יָצָא (" to lean upon "), cp. Mic. iii. 11 ; Isa. 1. 10 ; קָנָה (" to seek refuge "), cp. Zeph. iii. 12 ; Nah. i. 7 ; and specially by אָמַן (" to trust "), cp. 2 Kings xviii. 5 ; Ps. ix. 10 ; Isa. xxvi. 3, 4 ; Prov. xxviii. 25 ff., etc. Faith in God is characteristic of the apocalyptic writings and of the rabbis.

faith, to St. Paul, is something more than faith as presented in Judaism. There is a mystical element in it which is its very essence, and which is not found in the Old Testament conception. You cannot separate these two things—faith, and life in the Spirit. Faith is essential to life in the Spirit; but without life in the Spirit, there could be no real faith. The two things, both the gift of God, spring simultaneously into being. The mystical union with Christ begins with faith, and continues in faith: to be in the faith is practically equivalent to being in Christ.¹ The larger our share of life in the Spirit, the deeper, richer, and surer, our faith. By being in the faith, that is in fellowship with the Holy Spirit, forgiveness, reconciliation, justification, redemption, adoption, and all the other peculiar Christian graces and benefits inevitably follow, and the life expresses itself in love.

One of the chief reasons why the Church, and the modern Church in particular, has failed to make St. Paul understood by, and acceptable to, men, is because it has demanded and emphasised faith in such a way that the life with Christ has been obscured. It has not made sufficiently clear that faith without life is not only dead, but that it never has been alive. It is a still-born child. Without in any way minimising the significance of the faith, the emphasis should rather be laid on the life, the life in Christ. Tell modern humanity, not merely that you have something that you want it to believe, something that it would be advantageous for it to believe; but tell it that you have discovered a new life, a life that it too can test and find to be true, the most wonderful thing in the world, the one thing that can make a man feel certain that he is saved for time and eternity—and humanity will listen as it never will to an appeal simply to believe in certain things.

The modern Church is failing in its mission through its own fault. It has spent its energies too much in

¹ Cp. Deissmann, *Religion of Jesus and the Faith of Paul*, p. 208.

trying to present to the world what it would call the faith of St. Paul, or in more elaborated form what is commonly called "Paulinism." Both these efforts have in measure their justification and value. But it is the life in Christ and with Christ that is the real essence of St. Paul's message, and it is that alone which can save a lost man and a lost world.

Yet it cannot be said that all the blame for failure lies at the door of the Church. A man may fail to lay hold of the truth for one of two reasons. He may fail because the truth is wrongly or inadequately presented to him. He may also fail because he does not want to know the truth. It cannot be denied that all over our land to-day there are ministers of the Word who have found out St. Paul's secret of life with the Holy Spirit, life in Christ Jesus, and yet where is the parish where every one flocks to hear their message of life? Much of the failure is certainly due to distinctive modern tendencies and delusions, to the thought and life environment.

The most that any reasonable apologist for St. Paul would claim is that the vital central factors of his presentation of Christianity are permanent, and are what the modern world is needing as much as the world of St. Paul's own day did. There are features of St. Paul's outlook on men and things that are for ever past and gone. There is, for example, the unquestioning appeal to the authority of tradition as such in the thought-environment of St. Paul. To the modern man, everything in tradition, however old, however sacred, is an object of fearless criticism. Along with this, there is the confident belief that even the highest and best in tradition can be expanded and improved. It may, at the same time, be justly claimed that the Apostle was a pioneer of the modern attitude. For, while he certainly respected tradition, he subjected much of his ancestral faith to criticism, rejected many of the beliefs and practices of contemporary Judaism, and in any case recognised the

eternal progress open to all Christians under the safe guidance of the Holy Spirit.

Modern men would do well to recognise that there is a wise and unwise attitude towards tradition in the sphere of religion as elsewhere. The profitable study of history is that which enables us to appropriate from the past what is really advantageous, without allowing tradition either to depress or tyrannise over us. The profitable use of history is not that which would lead us to reject every idea handed down, simply because it belongs to a past age; but to examine, sift, and put to the test, these ideas, rejecting only that which is no longer tenable, retaining that which is beneficial, and using it at once as a guide and a stepping-stone to larger attainment and richer ideas. The most valuable harvest gleaned from tradition, from history, is not the discovery of a certain sequence of events, nor to be able to show that each epoch is a preparation for its successors, but the discovery of the operation of a spiritual life, the timeless Spirit of the Living God active in men. St. Paul would probably have said something like this—that the most valuable element in history is the discovery of evidence of the Holy Spirit working along with and in the spiritual life of men.

Again, St. Paul lived and moved in a world of dualisms,¹ whereas the modern world is convinced of the ultimate unity of the universe. Even when St. Paul strives to retain an unfaltering grip on monotheism, his world is a dualistic framework. Dualism runs through all his teaching: God and the demons, the Church and the world, the first and second Adam, spirit and flesh, mind and spirit, the law of Moses and the law of conscience, the pessimism of the sinful state and the optimism of the redeemed life, faith and unbelief, the mortal and the pneumatic body, the present age and the

¹ "Sein Monotheismus ist in einen dualistischen Rahmen gespannt"; cp. Weiss, "Die Bedeutung des Paulus für den modernen Christen"; (*Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 1919-20), S. 129.

world to come. To St. Paul, Satan and his forces opposed to God were stern realities, which had to be fought, overcome, and destroyed, in order that God might truly be Lord of all. His scheme of redemption postulates a bitter and unceasing antagonism between God and these hostile powers, which seemed to be victorious when Christ was crucified, but were led in triumph when Christ was raised from the dead. The continued work of the Risen Christ is to complete this operation, till, finally, these hostile forces are utterly subdued. Christian redemption is deliverance from the slavery under these unholy cosmic powers.

Now, to the modern man, these antagonistic cosmic powers are no longer realities in the way that they were to St. Paul.¹ Still, while we do not hold St. Paul's conception of these unholy hostile powers as personal or quasi-personal, we recognise the tragic fact of evil, which, in measure, is ultimately cosmic, and from which we need to be, and can be, delivered through Jesus Christ. Further, like St. Paul, we hold to the faith that God will ultimately root out all evil from the earth.

Nevertheless, we have to recognise a fundamental difference between St. Paul's outlook on the world and our own, and also a very considerable difference between his operations in seeking to win the world to Christ and our own. St. Paul's presentation of Christianity, and his method of applying it, are coloured throughout by the fact that he was essentially a Christian missionary.

Now while missionary effort is certainly a conspicuous and valuable portion of modern Church life, yet it is only a part. Our way of looking at things is different from that of St. Paul. Most modern Christians were not Jews in the early part of their life. They have thus no experience corresponding to St. Paul's conversion from Judaism. They have grown

¹ "In diesem Gedankengang ist uns Heutigen so gut wie alles fremd geworden"; cp. Weiss, *Die Bedeutung des Paulus für den modernen Christen*, S. 130.

up gradually in a Christian atmosphere, and have had no violent rupture with their past. The part of Church life which touches them most closely is the life of their own congregation. They are interested in any missionary work which that congregation may support. But they do not think of the main object of the congregation's existence as being missionary propaganda. They cannot readily realise the fervour of the converted Jew, St. Paul, passionately seeking to spread the gospel to the unconverted Gentile world. While having a certain amount of interest in the conversion of non-Christian peoples, they regard the Church as essentially a source of edification, guidance, and enlightenment, for those who all along have been in the Christian fold.

Broadly speaking, there are, in the modern world, three main attitudes towards religion. There is the attitude of those who accept traditional Christianity in one of its numerous forms as presented by different sections of the Christian Church. There is the attitude of those who refuse to accept it in any of its traditional forms, but who would fain have some form of religion which seeks and finds satisfaction for the foundation needs of the human spirit. And there is the attitude of those who have become so dehumanised, so grossly absorbed in materialistic and sensual interests, that they seem to have no hunger for religion. These last are the spiritually run down, the spiritually moribund, in whom a state of coma has set in.¹

These attitudes towards religion are not to be explained altogether in terms either of temperament or training. They are in large measure due to the peculiar spirit of the age, which is, on the whole, different from that in which Christianity was planted at the first. That latter age was marked by a certain feeling of tiredness, by the hopelessness of those who had tried everything, and

¹ When Eucken says "there is probably more antipathy against religion to-day and a more widespread and popular denial of it than has ever been the case before," we must understand the canonical types of religion; cp. *Main Currents of Modern Thought*, p. 466.

failed. The one exception to this was to be found in the life of the Mystery religions and the guilds. The modern world, on the other hand, is active, strong, resolute, confident of mastery in its own house and over its own soul, and critical in the extreme of all claims of tradition and privilege. There is, however, a twofold exception, the unquestioning submissiveness of the adherents of the Roman Church, and also, even in the case of those who look upon the faith and morality of the Roman Catholic as a slave superstition and a slave morale, a certain weariness of the spirit, disillusionment, and half-confessed despair. Neither the former nor the latter have discovered the way out. To find it we must go to St. Paul.

There is a difference also between the world of the Primitive Church and the world of to-day as regards the search for knowledge. Gnosis, in the earlier age, was sought after as a means of spiritual deliverance. In our day, on the other hand, there is a powerful, and perhaps growing, tendency to look upon knowledge from a purely utilitarian point of view, not as a thing to be striven after for its own sake, but as something which is likely to secure practical well-being for man individually or socially. How often to the modern undergraduate is the end and object of attending University lectures just a comfortable berth!

The age is frankly materialistic,¹ alike within and

¹ Now that the theory of electrons is fully vindicated, we ought, strictly speaking, to speak no longer of the material world. If the electron theory were fully understood by the mass of people, as it will certainly be one day, we should have to regard "materialism" as one of the back-numbers of the world's "isms." The term "electronism" will probably come to be used. But even the electron affords us no adequate explanation of the spiritual life of man. There is no immediate prospect of a bridge being found between these two. You cannot explain the mental, the spiritual, in man, even in terms of the electron. You cannot, on the other hand, explain the electron except through the mental and spiritual in man. It is incredible, whatever progress science may make, that the sum total of existence, including its highest form, human life and thought, can ever be explained in mere terms of physics and chemistry.

The modern rejection of the belief in miracles as exceptional and direct manifestations of the power of God is often cited as an evidence

without the Christian Church. How often are the pillars of the Church the world's most shameless profiteers! The huge collections of which they boast are their condemnation. To be of any merit in the eyes of God, these must needs embody alike the spirit and the sacrifice of the widow's mite. There is a growing feeling among many modern men, who have no sympathies with the Roman Church, that the indignation of a certain type of ultra-Protestant towards the brazen-faced selling of indulgences by the rascally Tetzels would be better justified if their own hands were clean. The modern Church, they are convinced, has sometimes degenerated into a great soulless money-making factory, where collections, not conversions, take the premier place. The difference, they are convinced, between Tetzels and the degenerate voluntary is that between the open trafficker in poisonous drugs and the surreptitious smuggler who deals in the same vile stuff. To a large section of modern democracy, the Church is simply a profiteers' combine. This is a serious accusation, which can only be met by a sincere manifestation of the spiritual life in the Church. In the meantime, democracy is swarming out of the doors, never to return, until the charge is proved to be untrue. It is certainly a serious state of matters for any branch of the Christian Church, if modern democracy looks upon it with disgust as a bastard brood of Mammon. There is only one way to healthy and enduring life, and that is for the Church to be reborn as an honest child of the Holy Spirit.

The modern world, however materialistic it may be, has no toleration for a church that is openly or covertly materialistic. While recognising that modern civilisation is in large measure a sordid bread hunt and a feverish

of the prevailing materialistic spirit. The morbid craving for the miraculous, which we find so marked in the spurious Acts of the Apostles, is, outside the Roman Church, no longer a feature of modern religious life. Here the Greek spirit as regards the miraculous has triumphed. At the same time the educated Christian can look upon all the wonders of Nature revealed by science as miracles.

will-o'-the-wisp chase after sensual gratification, modern humanity is becoming more and more convinced that these are ends which can never satisfy the higher spiritual life of men. It is for that reason peculiarly indignant with those forms of Church life which, under the veneer of religion, offer spurious remedies which at heart are mercenary and materialistic. Modern men are becoming increasingly convinced that materialistic absorptions are merely peripheral in their nature, and that they cheat humanity of its highest and best. They are coming to realise more clearly that the lack of unity in modern life is largely due to over-absorption in the pursuit of merely material ends; that alike the pernicious divisions in society and the disharmony and disunity in the personal life of the individual are due to this absorption; that a world of men guided only by material ideals must ever be a house divided against itself, a house which cannot stand; that some great unifying spiritual aim and ideal must be secured if humanity is to live.

What the modern world needs to discover is that the goal of the personal life is not a parochial realisation of material well-being for the individual or the State. It is, under all conditions, through self-surrender and sacrifice, to fulfil the purpose of God in the life of the Holy Spirit. A merely mechanical synthesis of the movements of life will never secure real unity either in the individual or in the social life. It is only by one simple yet sufficient guiding principle of life amid all the kaleidoscopic changes of existence that real unity can be secured, and that principle, at once simple and sufficient, is the life of the Holy Spirit.

As regards the general outlook on the nature and purpose of the individual life, there is a marked difference between St. Paul and modern men. In the former we certainly do not find the unhealthy craving for martyrdom, "the suicidal passion for death,"¹ which characterised a subsequent age. With a rare joy in his heart,

¹ Cp. Foakes-Jackson, *Studies in the Life of the Early Church*, p. 18.

St. Paul was out to turn all his efforts into the rich gold of Christian service. The present life was to be used to its utmost in this way. At the same time, there was a certain longing to be with Christ, which was "far better." Great masses of modern men are out to get the most out of their life, but this means only material goods and the pleasures and excitements of the flesh. The modern Christian certainly has a passion for service faithfully rendered to God and His Christ. He wants his life to continue, and to be always efficient, in order to render the best returns possible. He looks forward to the beyond as a prospective sphere of greater freedom and ampler powers to continue serving God. But it cannot be said that he is characterised by a strong yearning to leave the present world. He is satisfied that he has Christ already here, and finds his joy and satisfaction in doing Christ's work here.

In all modern life there is a strong personal note of the Greek type,¹ even if it does not always have a religious complexion. It persists, and will always persist, alongside of, and in spite of, such movements as Socialism, Syndicalism, Communism. The more virile and robust human life is, the more will this spirit be manifest. There is indeed the contemporary and influential doctrine that civilisation is what matters, and that the individual counts for nothing except in so far as he ministers to the well-being and progress of civilisation. But, after all, an argument of this kind can only impress the slave type of mind. The strong type of personality, the type which alone has given dignity and lustre to human life, will ever claim the right to judge contemporary civilisation, to disagree, if need be, with its trend—in short, will demand the right to live an independent spiritual life. It can never be a sufficient explanation of individual human

¹ What the Greeks, with whom St. Paul came so much into contact, ardently desired, was personal salvation, personal immortality. The teaching of the Mystery religions had greatly stimulated this desire. It may be claimed to be a perennial characteristic of the human soul that is truly alive.

effort and sacrifice to say that we have each to live and work for an abstract civilisation, the main benefits of which are to be reaped in some subsequent age. Each individual life must realise an end in itself. Alike modern bureaucracy and the modern trades union tend towards the submergence of the independent spiritual life. They both embody unhealthy tendencies. If humanity would make St Paul its guide, it would find that alike the individual and society would be secure in their respective just rights. There could be no antagonistic division of these two if both were Christian, if both were guided and inspired by the one dominating, unifying force of the One Holy Spirit. The man who has discovered the secret of St Paul can claim the right of well-justified independence for the highest of all reasons, that he knows himself to be immediately under the leadership of the Spirit of God, compared with which the most real forms of merely human civilisation are but as the shadow that creeps up the wall and is gone.

Each individual life has the inherent right to realise an end in itself. That end, no matter what the contemporary type of civilisation may be, is to the Christian a life experienced in the Holy Spirit. The man who is conscious of the life of the Holy Spirit pulsating within him, that life which is a timeless life, and gives its possessor a sense of triumphant superiority above the accidents and presumptuous tyranny of merely material things, is not only one who refuses to be a slave of any type of secular civilisation, but can claim to exercise the right to sit as judge over it, and lay bare its futilities, and all the time derives a constant sense of satisfaction from the certainty that he is more than a mere bit of driftwood aimlessly driven hither and thither in the cross-currents. He is the man whose heart is firmly stayed on God in the secure possession of God's Spirit, and a civilisation, were this realised, of such men would be an ideal civilisation, in which perfect unity would be secured between the individual and society. It is because this unity has not

been attained that modern civilisation, and the life of the average—nay, even the educated—man is a mass of unhappy contradictions, which are not fearlessly challenged as they ought to be, but lamely glossed over.

Much of the failure of modern civilisation is due to the fact that modern man is explained almost exclusively as the result of a long struggle with external necessities, as being simply the product of successive environments in a prolonged historical process. Biologically, and to a certain extent psychologically, he is this in large measure. But to accept this view absolutely, and without qualification, would be to strip man of any independent spiritual nature. Why should he have striven against the hardships and constraints of his environment, if there is not in him a something which inspires, as it demands, that struggle? Why should man persist in the desire to survive? Why should he struggle to modify and dominate his environment with a view to a decent form of survival? If environment, and struggle with environment, are the sole explanation of man as he is, why have some of the lower animals not attained to the same, or an even higher, level than man?

The view that man is simply the slave of his environment is fraught with danger. It tends to weaken man. It tends to make him increasingly dependent on others, to eliminate the all-important sense of personal responsibility, to make him a mere rivet in the fabric of society. The one way by which he can assert his freedom is by direct participation in the life of God, the way of St. Paul. In that way he drinks straight from the fountain-head, and is a first-hand sharer in the inspiration of all that is truly good and permanent, alike in the life of God, and in the life of man, God's child.

On every side we find abundant evidence that modern civilisation, even where it is neither religious nor inspired by the Holy Spirit, is filled with the spirit of rebellion against the binding chains of the thralldom of external environment. The spirit of modern youth is

the spirit of revolt. Bolshevism is an extreme example, but it is not an example to be altogether ignored, even if we disagree with it. At the very time, when political, social, industrial, and economic movements are tending towards the combination of larger masses of men, and, at the same time, towards the submerging of the individual, the voice of the individual is being raised in more clamant tones, demanding greater independence, a larger personal freedom. There is a grave risk that the existing fabric of civilisation may be shattered to its very foundations, if that voice is not heeded. We may denounce the modern craving for change, for new things, as superficial, as showing no evidence of earnest or sustained effort to examine these novelties and find proof of their essential value, as implying the glorification of a spirit of mere negation and rejection of what is traditional, without judging fairly of its perennial worth, as an assertiveness on the part of the comparatively uneducated masses to be the authoritative judges of what is valuable or not; but, beneath this craving for new things, there lies a deep discontent with the conditions of subservience to the prevailing environment, and it is madness to ignore it. We must remember that it is a robust age, as contrasted with a decadent age, which will fearlessly assert the spiritual freedom and independence of human personality.¹ The best type of modern dynamic not only aims at so freeing the personality of man from every alien restraint that man may be master in his own house, and live a life which is spiritually independent of what is external to that life, but increasingly strives to wrest from Nature the secrets of her operations, and to make her a slave ministering to human comfort and freedom.

There is nothing wrong in the modern human spirit demanding its freedom, its spiritual independence. The danger to be most strenuously avoided is the danger of

¹ Bergson, as truly as Kant, is a champion of the freedom of the human will.

making that claim in ways which in the end will spell a deeper slavery. This particularly applies to the problem of sex relationships. There is a growing demand for the removal of all restraints of marriage. If this becomes a universal demand, what are the consequences going to be? Will it not mean that there will be no proper parental control, the lowering of the moral status of woman, the exaltation of the merely physical, as compared with the higher ethical and spiritual, qualities, the suffering of the innocent and the destruction of all innocence, the suicidal abuse of the sex instinct, the undermining of the whole fabric of society? Modern men must be led to understand that to claim licence in the name of Nature is to make oneself the slave of Nature, and to forget that, in virtue of his spiritual equipment, man has a higher appeal to satisfy. In this, as in all else, the path of true freedom for modern humanity is in a better realisation of life in the Holy Spirit. It is the Holy Spirit alone that gives man real freedom.

The undoubted sense of emptiness and futility in the lives of so many modern men who are outside the fold is due to the selfish absorption in merely external things. In the scientific, or quasi-scientific, effort to secure increasing mastery over the material forces of Nature, with a view to selfish material advantages,¹ the modern mind seems to have lost its grip on its own spiritual self. Losing its real spiritual self, the modern mind tends to lose also all sense of an ennobling altruism. The common saying is, "Every man for himself." We have, on the one hand, the bovine satisfaction of the wealthy, and, on the other, the chronic catarrh of the soul of the discontented proletariat. Both are diseases which will have to be ruthlessly stamped out, like bubonic plague, before the soul of modern society is healthy.

The present age is a pathetic spectacle in its combination of success and failure. It has accomplished

¹ Communism is, in its essence, utilitarian, and a pure utilitarianism must always be antagonistic to the independent spiritual life.

great things. It has carried forward the movements begun in the nineteenth century. It is, in an unparalleled degree, at once the historian of all knowable past time, and the pioneer and discoverer of new lands. It has done more than all previous ages to gather up the broken fragments of the banquets of past epochs, and to break in, and sow, virgin soil, whose harvests future generations will surely reap. We understand the life of ancient Egypt, Babylonia, the Hittite Confederacy, and other peoples of the olden times, better than they understood themselves, and there is now practically no field of Nature which has not been scientifically examined, and, in measure at least, explained.

But there is conspicuous failure, as well as conspicuous achievement. In the multiplicity of cross-roads built by their own hands, men have lost, or failed to find, the Watling Street to God and the redeemed life.

It is in this respect that the Apostle to the Gentiles can help. Out of his own personal experience, he is able to tell us of that most real of all lives, the life with the Holy Spirit dwelling in our hearts and co-operating in all our legitimate undertakings with the human spirit : ¹ that life which secures at once a true faith and a sound morality, a liberty which is not licence, and an altruism which is fostered by God Himself, and which seeks in a spirit of unselfishness to help others to secure that which is highest and best, a truly unified life, because it is in reality part of the life of the One Living and True God, and a life which has only to be experienced to make us certain of its reality.²

¹ The fault of Eucken's system, with its timeless spiritual life, is that it describes that life in too vague terms. It fails to appreciate the highest quality of that life, namely its personal note. The timeless spiritual life, in which we share, and in which, in a special degree, we share as Christians, is personal. It is the Holy Spirit of God. St. Paul thus presents a system at once richer, fuller, more real, and altogether more satisfying, where Eucken only hints at a fragment.

² There is only one way to be certain that mathematics are true, that is to take the trouble to understand them. There is only one way to be certain that St. Paul's life in the Holy Spirit is not only the highest but the only real type of life, and that is to have it as a vivid part of our own experience.

If only modern humanity, craving for freedom, could see the one way out ! If only it could understand that the path to personal and social liberty can never be found by a reckless throwing off of restraints, without consideration of their value, or it may even be their sheer necessity, any more than the path of deliverance is to be found in the ethical militarism of the ascetic ! If only modern humanity could rediscover what St. Paul found, that there can be no real liberty apart from the free life in the Holy Spirit, then before civilisation there would be opened up the joyful prospect of undreamt-of freedom and happiness, the lacerated heart of the old world would be healed, and, as an immediate possession, each individual man would find himself the happy possessor of a new and irresistible will to rise above the sufferings, failures, and negations of life, without which the way to personal happiness must ever be closed.

It has to be frankly recognised that St. Paul's conception alike of God and the world is not accepted by a large proportion of modern men even in so-called Christian lands. To St. Paul, the knowledge of God and the understanding of the world were of the nature of a revelation through Christ and in Christ. There are even elements in what may be called St. Paul's cult of the Exalted Christ, *e.g.* St. Paul's habit of praying directly to Christ, which are difficult to many modern men who are avowedly Christian. The influence of the presentation of Christ in the Synoptic Gospels has led them to pray not to Christ, but directly to God, the Father, Himself. There is the further difficulty that to some it is hard to reconcile the presentation of God and the interpretation of the world given by the historical Jesus with the teaching of St. Paul. In both Jesus and St. Paul, however, there is certainly a sense of direct communion with God in a fellowship of love and obedience to His Will. In both, the relationship of God is religious rather than metaphysical. Both felt the nearness of God, as indeed the rabbis of the time also

did. Both accepted the ultimate supremacy of God, while believing in demons, and conceived of God as having the right to do what He wills with men, though, at the same time, always showing Himself to be merciful and just. To Jesus Christ, belief in the One Living and True God was essential. On the other hand, in all probability, there were Gentile Christians who accepted Christ as their Divine Lord, without fully grasping the truth of monotheism as it was rigidly held by all Jews. The average Gentile Christian, who had lived his life previous to conversion as a pagan, would accept Jesus Christ as a Saviour-God, when he had neither fully apprehended nor appropriated the strict monotheism held by St. Paul himself.

The modern world, in so far as it is Christian, absolutely accepts the monotheistic nature of God. Even those men in Christian countries who are not formally Christian, nevertheless, as a rule, accept the same view. But, even as regards the Christians of the modern world, it cannot be said, in very many cases at least, that the monotheism of St. Paul is accepted in the naive form in which he presented it. The conception of the relationship of God towards Nature and towards life is different. The ancient world, like the men of the Middle Ages, was impressed by the idea of permanence in these. The modern world recoils from this idea. It claims, as its right, freedom of movement, and discerns a process of becoming (progress) in all life and being. It is doubtful, however, if ultimately there is much divergence between the view of St. Paul and that of the modern world. St. Paul certainly emphasised the ultimately permanent, because divine, elements in the universe; but he also recognised two things, namely, that "the fashion of this world passeth away,"¹ and that there is a perpetual spring of youthful life in Nature, which finds its parallel in the continually renewed life of the Christian in the Holy Spirit. The Pauline position would be at once the

¹ I Cor. vii. 31.

recognition of permanent, because divine, elements, and, at the same time, change, progress, development, a progressive realisation of a Divine purpose, a constant movement towards a divinely appointed goal. Surely, even in our scientific age, there is room for an explanation of the world along these lines. What are we to offer as a better substitute for the Pauline conception of the world as originally the creation of God, as ultimately controlled at all times by Him, as in itself altogether good, though certainly in the meantime corrupted by sin and saddened by death, as a great field of missionary opportunity, and as destined ultimately to become altogether God's world?

In the first two chapters of Romans, St. Paul presents the revelation of God in Nature in intimate association with the revelation of God in the moral law. The modern world has difficulty in accepting this. Science studies Nature apart from all moral considerations, and indeed finds Nature in part at least unmoral. But, with our as yet limited knowledge of Nature, it is rash to affirm dogmatically what ultimately is implied in Nature. We must not define the moral law in a parochial way. It is just possible that, in a larger conception of it, all Nature may be found to be permeated with what is strictly ethical. There is a cosmic ethic as well as various types of human ethic, and it is the former that in the last issue must dominate. To criticise it is like criticising gravitation. It exists not to be criticised, but to be understood and obeyed. There is a suggestion of this line of thought in St. Paul's teaching concerning predestination. Much of the strongest in modern literature,¹ and the whole trend of modern science, seems to point towards something that is decisively like St. Paul's teaching as regards predestination. As in the case of St. Paul also, there is, alongside of this, a virile assertion of personal freedom and the independence of the human soul. Modern science affirms the inevitable sequence of cause and effect, and, at the same time, asserts the free operation of

¹ Cp. Hardy, *Dynasts*.

the human mind and personal responsibility. Neither modern thought, nor St. Paul, has a logical or complete explanation of this apparent antithesis to give. The streams run apart. Somewhere out in the deep they must be united. To the modern Christian who has imbibed the spirit of St. Paul, whether he be a highly trained scholar, or just a plain average man, there is ever present in his heart the dauntless faith which assures him that God is, that, in the Oneness of God, all apparent contradictions are ultimately reconciled, and that the way towards the realisation of this is life in the Holy Spirit.¹

In modern times we have the three main ways of approaching Nature—the æsthetic, the utilitarian, and the purely scientific. All of these can be followed without taking God at all into consideration. But all of them can be followed, not only by a man who believes that there is a God, but who feels himself under the direct guidance of the Holy Spirit. If he can do this he will find it altogether gain. The beauty of the earth will be a richer beauty to him, because it is the beauty of God's creative Mind. The power to use the forces of Nature will have a new value, because they are recognised to be the powers provided by God, for which those who feel themselves to be His children in the Holy Spirit are peculiarly and joyfully grateful. The wonderful secrets of Nature disclosed by physical and chemical researches will have a new meaning, because they are felt to be the secrets of that Father God, of the presence of whose Holy Spirit the Christian student is surely aware.

St. Paul in his day had very serious moral problems to deal with. It was an appallingly difficult task, for example, to impregnate a particularly vile city like Corinth with the ideal ethic of the Christian life. Yet the moral

¹ That thought of Bergson that instinct, even more effectively than reason, reaches a higher order of truth and touches life itself, is a rich and fruitful thought. We would claim, however, in the spirit of St. Paul, that it is in the possession of the Holy Spirit that human instinct truly awakens to its fullest powers of apprehension.

problems of to-day are not only larger, but more difficult. Modern humanity knows more, is more self-confident, more reckless, and more clamant in its claims. There are large numbers of modern men and women who regard the conception of sin itself as a kind of obsolete idea to be laughed at. They claim that the realisation of their own pleasure and satisfaction, altogether apart from the rights of others, altogether apart from any form of moral law, is their right. To them, the warnings of the preacher are a kind of bogey, which they assert the preacher himself knows to be a fake. To them, ethical standards, such as the Mosaic code, are merely man-made, and made with a dishonest purpose, namely, to exploit the proletariat, and are to be ruthlessly brushed aside. To them, all possession of capital is the real immorality.

What is the ultimate outcome of this attitude to be? It is certainly a serious consideration for people who possess the wealth of civilised lands, that the political power is now in the hands of the great masses who do not possess that wealth, and who are convinced that it is they who have made it, and they who have the right to hold and enjoy it. That drastic changes are inevitable is self-evident. The line of safety for all classes is surely that which seeks to do justice to all men under the guidance of the Holy Spirit. Sin is sin, and has always spelt misery to those who have become its slaves. But to discern the real nature of sin and its dire effects, men must see themselves and sin in the light of God. What St. Paul clearly saw was that God is a moral God, and that there is a moral law which is of God, and has to be obeyed, if man is to secure real happiness. Christianity, as presented by St. Paul, not only originated a new ethic, but an ethic which is valid for all time, an ethic which implies complete surrender to the Will of God, and is ever inspired by the Spirit of God. It recognised that man in himself is ever weak, that his only real strength lies in the life of the Holy Spirit.

In modern life we find a strong inclination to look at weakness and strength from the economic point of view. The weak economically, the poor, are the good : the strong economically, the rich, are the bad. There may be an element of truth in this ; but it does not go to the root of things as St. Paul's conception does. To St. Paul, the moral God has revealed Himself in a moral law. Sin is a stern reality, and the only way out of the bondage of sin is through penitence and forgiveness¹ in the life of grace, the life in the Holy Spirit. His categorical imperative was revealed in, and made operative by, the life of the Holy Spirit. While he abrogated the ceremonial law, and came to regard the moral law of Moses as helpless in itself to save a man, he felt that every moral life must be a life subject to the law of God. His clear apprehension of the significance of law in life is in keeping with the spirit of modern science, where the concept of law holds a central place. Sound morality to St. Paul is simply the deliberate choice, together with the corresponding behaviour, of that which is in complete harmony with the Holy Spirit living in the heart of the redeemed man. It is a pragmatism, securing the only true good alike for the individual and for humanity, which can be proved by simply being put to the test.

In nothing does the modern world need some form of wise guidance more than in those matters which concern patriotism and the spirit of nationalism. Future historians will recognise that the real cause of the Great War was the misuse of the patriotic, the national spirit. That same misuse, unless better guidance be in the

¹ The rabbinical teaching was that if there was sincere and sufficient repentance, the most grievous sin could be forgiven. Jesus lays special stress on the need that men should forgive others in order to be themselves forgiven. St. Paul taught that forgiveness was the gift of God through Jesus Christ.

The modern Church is readier to forgive the lapsed than the churches of St. Paul were. It made a difference to the Church then that the State was pagan. An apostate, who had undergone excommunication, found it practically impossible to be received back into the fold. His sin was like that of a soldier deserting in the face of the enemy. The harder the campaign, the stricter the discipline must be.

meantime obtained, will lead to still more deadly wars. Alike party politics, and international politics, rest in large measure, at the present time, on a wrong, a diabolical, basis, namely, pure selfishness. A proper basis would be found in a patriotism, which, while seeking to secure the well-being of one's own people, is not, at the same time, injurious to the well-being of other nationalities : which keeps strictly in view the common humanity of all men, and aims at the fullest service of God's kingdom throughout the world. The modern tendency to glorify the State, and to make loyalty to it the rallying-point of all sorts and conditions of men apart from all ethical and ideal considerations, is doomed to end in the wilderness, unless the State is quickened and inspired by the Spirit of God. St. Paul, while possessing the high distinction of being a Roman citizen, and understanding the Roman empire remarkably well,¹ not only obeying its laws, but showing respect for it and confidence in it, did not by any means glorify that State beyond its merits. His attitude towards the Roman State does not suggest that he thought it ideal. How could a pagan empire be that to a Christian apostle, whose ideal state was the kingdom of God on earth ?

If St. Paul were alive in the world of to-day, his message to men would probably be this : be a loyal citizen to, and obey the laws of, the land in which you live. Try to live the life of one who is at once patriotic

¹ The Book of Acts, though not written by St. Paul, is certainly a book in the latter part of which we breathe the Pauline atmosphere. Its writer is singularly accurate in regard to the difficult subject of the administration of the Roman empire and its provinces. He is right in regard to his description of the "politarchs" of Thessalonica (Acts xvii. 6, 8). His presentation is confirmed by many inscriptions. Compare also the reference to the magician Elymas of Cyprus, and the comites or cohorts amicorum, who accompanied a Roman governor in his province. Sergius Paulus is probably to be identified with one of the curators of the Tiber. He was probably also the Sergius Paulus who contributed portions of the *Historia Naturalis* which contain special information in regard to Cyprus. Compare also the use of the term *πρώτη*, "first," as applied to Philippi (Acts xvi. 12), and meaning of the first rank or class. Compare also the use of the word *μερὶς*, meaning the subdivision of a large district or province.

and under the direct guidance of the Holy Spirit; yet, with all your patriotism, do not forget the highest interests of the larger brotherhood of mankind throughout the world. Let your patriotism be a constructive patriotism, not only for the good of your own people, but for the good of the world. He would probably say that the world is not yet ripe for the realisation of an international State. He would doubtless also say that such an international State will come when the whole world is truly won to Christ, and would, in that case, be identical with a world-wide realisation of the kingdom of God. Without doubt, at the heart of Christianity, there is a principle, which, when universally accepted and applied, will logically lead to the establishment of one world-wide State, superior to all racial distinctions and antagonisms, and simply based on the Fatherhood of God and the Christian brotherhood of man.

The most serious problems to be faced by all civilised lands to-day are those which have to do with the relationships of Capital and Labour. The longer a satisfactory solution of these problems is delayed, the more precarious will the situation of modern civilisation become. Nor can there be any doubt that the solution is not to be found along the lines hitherto tried. The age is past for any attempt to down the proletariat. The political power is now in the hands of the people, and the only line of safety for the rich and well-to-do is to seek a solution which will secure justice to all classes and conditions of men. We are convinced that St. Paul discovered the main principles along which such a solution alone can be secured.¹

There is a modern view of primitive Christianity which is winning for itself a certain amount of support, and which sees in primitive Christianity a proletarian mass-movement in which Jesus played a comparatively

¹ It cannot be said that we find in St. Paul's letters a system of economics. But we do find the clear presentation of ethical principles which apply to these, and indeed are at the foundation of all sound economics.

small part.¹ This theory misrepresents the true nature of Christianity, and does grave injustice to its Founder, Jesus Christ. It reads into primitive Christianity a meaning which was never there, and leaves its genesis unexplained.

On the other hand, even if Jesus disclaims all interference, as a "divider," in a dispute in regard to property, He certainly embodies in His teaching a principle which has a far-reaching significance in regard to the problems which men are seeking to solve at the present time. In His parable of the Labourers in the Vineyard,² Jesus clearly lays down the principle that the man who is willing to work is not to be made to suffer hardship because he is not able to start work as early as certain others of his fellow-labourers. All alike get their penny. The labourer is clearly to be judged not by the amount of work that he was able to do, but by his willingness to work. It might, of course, be argued, that it was quite within the power of the owner of the vineyard not to pay the penny to all alike. But, as a matter of fact, this is what he did not do. And in any case we can understand the position of the modern worker who says that this teaching of Jesus is clearly in support of the contention that every willing worker is entitled to work or maintenance.

St. Paul apparently lays down the rule that every able-bodied Christian should be willing to work, should be eager to work, and, if a man is unwilling to work, that he has no right to eat.³

St. Paul himself was at once a preacher of the Word and one who rejoiced to toil with his own hands at his trade. To him the humblest of work, faithfully and willingly done, was honourable. In this he differed from

¹ Its chief exponents are Kalhoff and Kautsky. The theory misrepresents the essential character of Christianity, and ignores the obvious fact that Jesus Christ was from the first recognised to be at once the core and inspiration of the movement—that indeed there could have been no Christianity without Christ.

² Cp. Matt. xx. 1 ff.

³ Cp. 2 Thess. iii. 10.

the common Greek point of view, according to which the labouring man was looked down upon with contempt, and work was regarded simply as a necessity, not a thing honourable in itself. The all-too-common attitude prevailing at the present time, which regards all work as a thing to be avoided as far as possible, a thing undesirable, is thus more akin to the pagan or Greek view of St. Paul's time. In justice also, it must be said that it is part of the evil heritage of the past—a heritage for which the upper classes are responsible, inasmuch as they formerly looked down upon workers as such, and, in particular, regarded all trade as vulgar. It is an illustration of the truth that the sins of one generation are the seeds producing a bitter harvest to later generations, a harvest peculiarly bitter to the very class who sowed the pernicious seeds.

We need at the present time a vigorous proclamation of the gospel of work—a gospel setting forth the wisdom, the beauty, the delight, and the sheer necessity of work. It is the gospel to which all classes would do well to listen. Population, race, situation, climate, and natural wealth will always play an important part; but, other things being equal, it is the nation of the hardest and most skilful workers that must inevitably become the greatest and most influential. It is the workers in more senses than one who are destined to inherit the earth.¹

No matter what class a man or woman may belong to, they are called upon to do honest and useful work. The parasite of any class is a criminal. No man or woman has any right to enjoy the privileges of a country

¹ It is imperative that modern democracy should recognise that work produces work. The law of supply and demand, which was long believed to be a pervading law, absolute in its nature as gravitation, and in no way to be tampered with without running the gravest economical risks, is looked upon in a new way by the modern Labour movement, which claims the right to so curtail the supply that the demand will be uniformly maintained, and the cost of supply will be regulated. This proposed interference is, however, not the last word. To regulate supply artificially for the sake of maintaining a high standard of wages encourages the quest for substitutes, and may even lead to the total destruction of an industry, and so mean considerable unemployment and no wages at all.

who is not by their life's work rendering faithful service to that country. There are many people in our own land, people who pride themselves on their intelligence, who nevertheless fail to see the obvious fact, that while the ignorant and disgruntled agitator may be a menace to the State, the idle rich, who are simply living for their own selfish ends, are a greater menace. It is a pure fake to put forward the argument that, if the healthy leisured classes take up work, they are depriving their poorer brethren. Certainly no one who has a sufficient private income has any right to undertake work which will deprive a needy brother or sister of their living. But the opportunities of rendering voluntary unpaid social service, which the leisured rich could and should undertake, are boundless.¹ In any parish the minister could provide such social service. The shame is that the Church continues to make its appeal, and that there is in many instances no response. These people would do well to realise that the day of invitation to do their duty is far spent—that another day, the day of compulsion by the none too tender hands of democracy, is at hand.

This problem did not emerge immediately in the sphere of St. Paul's work, though it certainly existed in a glaring form in the world of his day. The class with which he had to do were those who had to work if they were to live. And he laid down the general principle that, unless a man was prepared to work, he deserved to starve. But, if St. Paul had had to do with the leisured and idle rich of his day, there can be little doubt that his injunction to them would have been to work, to use their special opportunities to do special work, to minister to God and His people.

The modern claim of Labour that the worker is entitled to receive either work, or, failing that, maintenance, does not explicitly emerge in St. Paul's world

¹ That is a fine thought that we owe to Pliny: "God is the helping of man by man; and that is the way to eternal glory"; cp. *Nat. Hist.* ii. 17, 18.

as a general economic problem. The, as yet small and feeble, Christian Church, existing only by sufferance, could not think to influence effectively the legislation of the great pagan Roman State. But the Christian Church could at least give its own example. When honest Christian workers had done their best to secure employment and had failed, there could never be any question of allowing these to starve. Now that the modern State is Christian, it is only fair to expect that the example of the Christian community in early times should be followed by the professedly Christian State. Had St. Paul lived in our day, we, knowing his spirit, can fairly well conclude what his teaching would have been. We may be certain that his position would have been as follows. No man of sterling moral worth should ever be allowed to starve. The willing worker ought to be provided with work by the Christian State or otherwise; or, failing that, he should be decently maintained until work is available. Let any man of the better classes put himself in the place of the unemployed labouring man, and ask, Would he himself be satisfied with less? Would he think that less than this was justice?

Of course the application of this principle must mean serious burdens to the State. But no righteous State, nor any just man, will shirk legitimate burdens. These burdens, moreover, must lie on all—in a lesser degree on the employed workers, in a greater degree on the rich.

The real difficulty, standing in the way of the fulfilment of the just demand that the Christian State should provide either work or maintenance, lies in this, that a considerable portion of the population of modern States does not wish to work. The people of this class would prefer to subsist on a moderate dole, rather than undertake work, even when it secured a better standard of living. These people are certainly as much parasites as the idle, selfish rich, and it is to be feared that the principle of State doles encourages an increase of this type of person. A measure of destitution for people of

this class would be wholesome. In the spirit of St. Paul, if a man will not work, let him starve.¹ The future security of the State demands that drastic steps should be taken. Any State which has a large and increasing unemployed population, unemployed because there is no honest desire to do work, is in a perilous condition. If the modern State is to enjoy a sound economic health, the shirkers of all classes must be eliminated.

Of course St. Paul has a remedy, if only people would adopt it. He would have all men permeated by the life of the Holy Spirit. If that were secured, you would have the ideal State. The man, who is under the guidance of the Spirit of God, has a corresponding morality. He feels that it is a privilege and a joy to contribute his quota to the sum total of the nation's achievement. If all men were truly Christian, the principle of work or maintenance would forthwith become practical economics. There would be no useless, unproductive lives, no shirking, no injustice. All this leads to the conclusion that the soundest economics demand the wholesale realisation of the Christian spirit in the State. In the ideal Christian State there would be no loafers, no destitution, no well-founded sense of grave injustice done.

There is, in the spirit of St. Paul, an urgent call to all to do faithful service, and a just demand on the part of the masses that every honest citizen will obtain labour sufficiently remunerated, or, failing that, that he will not be allowed to beg his bread. Speaking in the name of Christ and justice, it must be recognised that there is something wrong with a State where the overfed profiteer, who never was within a hundred miles of a bursting German shell, should live in vulgar luxury, while there are homeless and penniless men, who risked their lives, endured untold hardships, suffered excruciating wounds, wandering the roads, and eating the scant bread of the

¹ Pindar anticipated the teaching of St. Paul: "For hunger is altogether meet companion of the man who will not work"; cp. *Works and Days* (Mair's translation), p. 11.

vagrant. If we are to deal with economic problems in the spirit of St. Paul, we must not adopt the insane policy of making war on capital as such, but set our minds to the elimination of all wrong use of capital. We must act on the principle of seeking to do what is at once just and kind to all citizens. We must recognise that every honest citizen is a valuable asset of the Empire, whose well-being is a matter of practical interest to all other citizens. We must recognise that the insurgent demands of the lower classes, and the exasperated longing of the capitalist for economic peace, can only be attained in a way that will satisfy all, by all being guided and permeated by the Spirit of God, the Holy Spirit. Can there be any doubt that the apostle to the Gentiles presents the key to the solution of all our economic difficulties?

A very common attitude of modern times would substitute art for religion, the gratification of the æsthetic sense of beauty for the higher moral and spiritual life. Importance is attached to form, content is regarded as a secondary matter.¹

Now the merely artistic view of life can never be complete, because it ignores the fact that the world cannot be interpreted altogether in terms of artistic appreciation and delight. Self-control or morality cannot be ignored, alike on personal and social grounds. To Jesus, the beautiful, the true, and the good are not only one, but all these are essentially divine, and only realisable in the life of the child of God. St. Paul understood this, although, in his case, the emphasis is laid rather on the good and the true, than on the beautiful as such.² Looked at from the modern standpoint, St. Paul's

¹ While St. Paul gives no immediate guidance in regard to this, we are safe to affirm that he would have attached importance to the content, and that he would in fact have said that the ideal artist would be he who was inspired by the Holy Spirit, the Spirit of all real beauty, in all his work.

² St. Paul shows no evidence of what may be called the religion of beauty. In the case of Jesus Christ it was different (cp. Matt. vi. 28 ff.). The Christian Church of the early centuries was, on the whole, marked by the attitude of St. Paul, and in this respect compared unfavourably with contemporary paganism.

manner of thinking would lead us to regard art, morality, science, and religion as parts of a harmonious whole, the heritage and possession of the children of God, the children who are in fellowship with the Spirit of Jesus Christ.

Mere "æsthetical subjectivism" ¹ has no substantial moral background. Art ceases to be free, when it becomes (as so often it does at the present time in dealing with sex) a propagandist of mere sensuality. There is no greater degradation of art than to make it a mere pander. Its glowing colours do not make its abhorrent repulsiveness to the pure mind any the less revolting. Mere æsthetical subjectivism is to be condemned, because it fails to recognise that sound morals are not necessarily identical with correct manners in accordance with prevailing social standards. It fails also because it does not give due importance to the ethical authority of ethical standards gained in the long and painful development of human history. It holds the mistaken view that revolt from all restraint is the certain road to the betterment of life. It ultimately resolves itself into a policy of snatching the transitory pleasures of the moment, into a life of sheer self-indulgence. It is thus in no sense of the word an ethic, but the rejection of ethics. It is a theory of life which is expressed in the phrase, so fraught with danger, "having a good time." It is virtually a deification of the senses, and ignores the all-important fact that man's true life can only be realised in communion with the Spirit of God.

The artistic, the æsthetic, interpretation of existence is not a creation of the modern world. It originated in the Greek genius, and had held a place in the world of men long before St. Paul's day. It postulated the orderliness of reason present in all existence, and sought to interpret all life in terms of beauty and symmetry. Face to face with a larger knowledge of the perplexities, complications, and insoluble riddles of life and being, it

¹ Cp. Eucken, *Main Currents of Modern Thought*, p. 401.

broke down, although, so long as it did not discover its own fragmentariness and insufficiency, it certainly provided the human mind with a compact and joyous interpretation and presentation of existence.

Now it is practically certain that St. Paul had no real understanding of the Greek artistic interpretation of life and being. His attitude was that which was assumed by the whole Christian Church of early times. It is to many an amazing fact that, in all his wanderings through the splendid cities of his missionary operations, St. Paul gives no evidence of appreciation of the undoubted beauty of the pagan temples. Perhaps this was due to his Hebrew heritage, which would lead him to discern only one kind of real beauty, the beauty of holiness. Unlike his Master, Jesus, who shows a real appreciation of the beauty of Nature, St. Paul appears to have had no eyes for this. Part of the explanation may lie in the fact that he was town-bred ; but the chief explanation was probably temperamental and religious.

At the same time, the general principle, which runs right through all St. Paul's Christian life and teaching, surely applies here. Nothing can ever be done as it ought to be done, except where a man is directly under the guidance of the Holy Spirit. God is the ultimate Source and Creator of all beauty. No interpretation of that beauty can ever hope to be worthy, unless the interpreter is in direct harmony with the Spirit of God.

To the modern world, St. Paul is able to point the way of salvation, deliverance, and true progress. This applies alike to the individual man and to human society as a whole. What he discovered was that life in the Holy Spirit is the one real and fruitful manner of life. He presents a system at once eschatological and mystical, a piety at once personal and social. The presence of the Holy Spirit in the redeemed heart solves all riddles of the personal and social life of man. That presence is described in various ways, but it always implies a mystical communion with the Holy Spirit, who is Jesus Christ,

the Risen Lord.¹ The human soul without the Holy Spirit is like a tiny pool of sea-water cut off from the mother ocean. Left thus, it must lose its freshness, and presently become dried up by evaporation. When the Holy Spirit enters into a man's heart, it is like the rolling in of the tide, at once connecting up the segregated pool, and filling it up to overflowing with fresh sea-water.

St. Paul's life in the Holy Spirit succeeds where other methods must signally fail. Mere rationalism, claiming an independent spiritual life, a life which is independent of its environment, has this weakness, that it tends to separate the spiritual life from the reality of the external world, and throws life and thought back into an abstract and shadowy existence. That cannot happen in the life presented by St. Paul, because the Spirit living in him is the Spirit of God, in whom all things live, and move, and have their being. Empiricism, which denies the existence of an independent spiritual life, and seeks to explain all that we understand by the spiritual life as due to external influences, fails in two ways. It does not take account of all the data, and fails to understand that external facts would have no meaning to us without an independent spiritual existence. St. Paul's life in the Holy Spirit is all-comprehensive, and, behind it, there is the sublime truth that God is a Spirit, and that only in the light and life of that Spirit can a true explanation of the universe be found. The merely mechanical theory of the universe does not explain the obvious facts of the universe. Purpose is a real part of the spiritual life of man, whether we consider the life of the individual, or humanity as a whole. Purpose is

¹ "In Christ" and "Christ in me" refer to the Exalted Christ. "In Christ" expresses the mystical state of the Christian here on earth: "with Christ" is eschatological, and indicates the condition of the saints in the afterwards with Christ, *i.e.* in the completely realised spiritual body. "Through Christ" in the majority of cases refers to the Risen Lord. The genitive Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ is usually a mystical genitive, and is practically equivalent to "in Christ." Deissmann would understand "in the blood of Christ" and "in the name of Christ" as both mystical; cp. Deissmann, *The Religion of Jesus and the Faith of Paul*, pp. 171 ff.

thus an actual factor of the sum-total of existence. But a purely mechanical universe could have no place for purpose. It fails in this, as it fails in explaining progressive movement. In St. Paul's life of the Holy Spirit there is not only scope for human purpose, but, by possessing the Holy Spirit, man is linked on to the purpose of God, the ultimate director and guide of all history, and his capabilities of making progress are limited only by the will of God regarding man.

Though St. Paul's mysticism was reacting mysticism, he combined it with a virile ethic, and was marked in all his life by a strenuous activity. To him the greatest of all virtues was active love, which ever prompts a man to joyous service rendered to others, and to voluntary suffering with and for others. The τέλειοι of St. Paul were not like the τέλειοι of the Mystery religions, a race of aristocrats standing aloof, but men specially and completely consecrated to self-sacrificing labours, in the Christian community, and among men in general.¹ Deissner would call St. Paul's mysticism "Glaubensmystik," "faith-mysticism";² but it is more than that. It is rather "life-mysticism," i.e. a mysticism which embraces the whole life, and is in itself life, the life of the Holy Spirit and the life of the redeemed man in constant communion. It embraces at once the subjective and the objective sides of the personal life, the theoretical and the practical. It combines reacting mysticism with strenuous activism, intellectualism with voluntarism. St. Paul was a pragmatist in the sense that his message, the gospel, not only claimed to be a remedy for human ills, a message of hope and deliverance, a promise of a better order of things, but, when put into actual practice, proved itself to be all these things. At the basis of his pragmatism is God, the ultimate truth and reality, and God has been revealed in the Incarnate, Crucified, and Risen Christ.

¹ Cp. Deissner, *Paulus und die Mystik seiner Zeit*, S. 41.

² Cp. Deissner, *op. cit.* S. 134.

St. Paul's experience of the direct indwelling and influence of the Holy Spirit is not to be regarded as mere psychologism. The felt presence of the Holy Spirit in the redeemed life is the most vivid, direct, and indisputable of all experiences. The Christian can have no more doubt in regard to the personal reality of the Holy Spirit, than he can have in regard to the air which he inhales into his lungs.

The possession of the Holy Spirit provides a type of life that is ever young, for there is no ageing of that Spirit which is life itself. The mature Christian has thus the advantage of combining the growing experience of years with a spirit of perpetual youth. This advantage is shared alike by the individual and the community. It follows from this that, to the Christian, the ageing of the body is nothing more than the contracting of prison walls. Break the walls down, and the spirit springs out into the boundless freedom of fuller life. Hence death to the Christian is at once deliverance and the way to fullness of life.

The presence of the Holy Spirit in the redeemed heart is demonstrated not merely by certain feelings—comfort, peace, hope, love. It confers special gifts of power. It originates and energises new thought. It gives a distinct colour and substance to the ethical life, indeed to the entire life. Personal salvation through the life of the Holy Spirit is, according to St. Paul, something far better than the hysterical, and altogether inadequate, presentation of it as deliverance from destruction. To St. Paul, personal salvation through the Holy Spirit is rather winning for life its real value. It provides true freedom for the human spirit, deliverance from the bondage of the Law on the one hand, and from the tyranny of the flesh on the other. It leaves the human spirit free to investigate and understand everything that is interesting and deserving to be an object of study. Its freedom is thus at once the freedom of art, morality, and science. The God, whose Spirit operates with vivid

realistic force in the life of the Christian, is the Creator of the artistic faculty, and the existential background of the operation and enjoyment of that faculty. He is the God who is holy, and is therefore the source of the categorical imperative demanding a right ethic. He is the God who is in and through all that we know of the material world, and whose presence and creative activity makes that world capable of being scientifically known. All this is embraced in St. Paul's teaching originating out of his own experience.

If the modern Church is failing in large measure to reach the heart of the modern world, it is because the modern Church has yet to discover the secret of St. Paul,¹ who is the Peter Pan of the religious life, the man who has discovered and embodied in his own life the secret of perpetual spiritual youth. There is nothing wrong with the Christianity of St. Paul, when it is rightly understood and practically realised. There is much wrong with the Church, and more wrong with civilisation, as they exist to-day. The only road, by which alike the Church and civilisation can go with any hope of becoming all that they ought to be and might be, is to set out to rediscover St. Paul. The failure of Christianity to christianise the whole body of human civilisation is not want of a sufficient dynamic at its disposal, but failure to appropriate that dynamic and apply it with irresistible conviction and earnestness. It is this dynamic which St. Paul offers.²

¹ How far St. Paul's teaching is a living, guiding, vivifying force in the Christian world of to-day is difficult to estimate, alike because of the size of the Christian world, the variety of forms in which Christianity presents itself, and the difficulty of getting a clear understanding of the psychology and of the whole spiritual outlook of the individual Christian.

² Speaking of Christianity, Eucken says: "The form which it has historically acquired cannot be permanently retained" (cp. *Main Currents of Modern Thought*, p. 277). This is undoubtedly true, but, like all mere negations, it does not help much. Better to affirm positively, as we are convinced we can, that by realising the full meaning of St. Paul's life in the Holy Spirit, we should secure a form of Christianity which is destined to be eternal, and which is capable of absolutely saving mankind.

Because of the startling rapidity of modern life, its lack of clear understanding and clear guidance, its failure to comprehend itself and its *raison d'être*, and its consequent bewilderment, there is clamant need for some definite, sound, and sufficient directing principle of life. The desideratum of modern life is to find and to hold fast to some path of safety, a secure road running through the immense territory commanded by the modern mind. It becomes more and more certain that a purely secular type of civilisation, a civilisation which is purely the product of mere human effort, can never be satisfactory. All attempts to form such a civilisation must inevitably lead to the desert.

A truly satisfactory type of civilisation can never rest on a merely secular, on a merely human basis. A truly worthy civilisation, St. Paul would seem to say, must be spiritual in its genesis and in its inspiration. Not even the human spirit by itself can secure such a civilisation, because the human spirit in itself is weak and incapable of truly great achievement. It is only when the human spirit is permeated and sustained by the Holy Spirit that it realises its true being and power, and becomes capable of establishing a truly worthy and sufficient type of civilised life. A civilisation attained by the human spirit, co-operating in living and loving communion with the Holy Spirit, would thus be the realisation of the kingdom of God on earth. A civilisation founded on mere physical science, economics, politics, or ethics, can never altogether satisfy the human heart. A truly ideal civilisation must at bottom be religious, inspired by the Spirit of God. "Howbeit seek ye His kingdom, and these things shall be added unto you."

It would be an altogether unhealthy and unprogressive condition of affairs if the Church as an institution dominated science, economics, politics, and æsthetics. The vocation of the Church is simply to be a witness of God, a preacher of salvation through Jesus Christ, and a servant of the people. But, at the same

time, the one satisfactory condition of life is where alike the individual man and society—in dealing with the problems of science, history, economics, politics, æsthetics, and ethics—enjoy the full spiritual freedom and power of life in the Holy Spirit. This is what is implied in the teaching of St. Paul.

When we find the waters of the lowland river muddy and unpalatable, it is good to take to the hills, and drink again at the pure fountain-head where the river takes its rise. Alike the modern Church and modern civilisation would do well to go to St. Paul, and to find in him the ever fresh inspiration of a spiritual life which is at once personal, genuine, and sufficient, the life in unbroken communion with the Spirit of God in Jesus Christ.

Using the key which St. Paul presents, they will find that, in the realisation of this spiritual life, there is no ultimate dualism of Nature and spirit. A higher and more harmonious conception of human life and destiny will be carried into operation. Man will at once fill his proper place and do his proper work in regard to Nature, and will realise, at the same time, his purely spiritual life in strenuous activities. The ideal of worthy manhood will not simply be the excellent sportsman, farmer, manufacturer, or engineer, but one who, at the same time, is something of a prophet, a priest, and a saint ; in any case, one possessed by that Holy Spirit, which holds the secrets of all existence, and rules and guides the world.

Along the road which St. Paul has indicated, humanity will become possessed of a morality which can never degenerate into mere personal habit, social custom, or polite manners, because the ethic of St. Paul is continually nourished from the spring of the timeless and tireless Spirit of God. In place of the contemporary and erroneous conception that all evolution must be progress, St. Paul would point to an altogether certain source of genuine progress alike spiritual and ethical—the larger participation in the life of God. There is no limit to the future achievements of humanity, if only it

can discover and appropriate St. Paul's secret of the life that is hidden with God in Jesus Christ.

Humanity of to-day is like David of old, longing to drink of the water "of the well of Bethlehem which is by the gate." But the bravest and most willing of men cannot bring that water. Humanity must take the hill-road itself, and, if it is to have the strength to reach the well and drink, it must go in the Spirit of the Living God and His Christ—it must go as St. Paul went. Only going thus equipped and inspired, can humanity hope to hear the song of the angels of the resurrection and the life which is eternal because it is the life of God.

INDEX

- Achilles, 198.
 Acts, 77, 140, 219, 262.
 Adam, 5, 18, 43, 65, 75, 150, 151, 186, 191.
 Adiaphora, 21, 166.
 Æsthetical Subjectivism, 270.
 Aetius, 78.
 Agnosia, 60.
 Ahriman, 107, 109, 151, 223.
 Ahura Mazda, 67, 90, 223.
 Alexander the Great, 13, 22, 31, 107.
 Allegorical Method, 27, 85.
 Amos, 144.
 Amynos, 121.
 Anaxagoras, 78.
 Anaximenes, 78.
 Anthesteria, 104, 197.
 Antioch, 86, 241.
 Antiphanes, 201.
 Anunnaki, 194.
 Aphrodisius, 201.
 Apocalypse of Baruch, 212.
 Apocalypse of St. John, 37.
 Apocrypha, the, 65, 150.
 Apollo, 39, 89.
 Apollodorus, 199.
 Appian, 13.
 Apuleius, 78, 95, 120, 172, 173, 189.
 Archelaus, 78.
 Aristarchus, 47, 197.
 Aristides, 51, 147.
 Aristophanes, 99, 194, 198.
 Aristotle, 1, 6, 7, 158, 200.
 Arrian, 13.
 Asceticism, 98, 164, 165.
 Asclepius, 67, 69, 162.
 Ashirta, 42, 197.
 Assumption of Moses, 194, 212.
 Astrology, 17, 19, 33, 162.
 Athena, 33, 89.
 Athenodorus, 38.
 Athletics, 29, 41, 42, 113, 123.
 Attis, 34, 94, 181, 193, 211.
 Augustine, 43.
 Augustus, 3, 12, 13, 34, 38, 69, 109, 130, 162.
 Babylonian Talmud, 58.
 Bacchus, 120, 180, 212.
 Ball, 221.
 Baptism, 77, 78, 91, 106, 145, 146, 173, 174, 175, 176, 177, 178, 181, 182.
 Baptism for the dead, 174, 210.
 Barnes, 193.
 Baruch, 213.
 Baudissin, 56, 57, 58, 59, 76, 80.
 Bel, 211.
 Ben Sirach, 150.
 Bergson, 253, 259.
 Berosus, 23, 112, 223.
 Berr, 34.
 Biblical Antiquities of Philo, 56.
 Bickell, 72.
 Blood, 26, 159, 180.
 Body, 93, 151, 152, 154, 163, 176, 180, 187, 197, 198, 200, 201, 202, 203, 205, 208, 209, 211, 212, 213, 274.
 Bœtians, 197.
 Boghaz Keui, 88, 106.
 Böhlig, 8, 17, 33, 38, 40, 41, 56, 68, 71, 72, 74, 75, 79, 80, 85, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 106.
 Book of Adam and Eve, 212.
 Book of the dead, 23.
 "Boukoloi," 122.
 Boulanger, 48, 96, 98, 99, 100, 199.
 Boule, 150.
 Bousset, 14, 15, 17, 38, 39, 47, 56, 64, 65, 66, 68, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 76, 77, 78, 87, 93, 111, 145, 151, 162, 163, 168, 191, 210, 211, 236, 241.
 Bread, 128, 180, 181.
 Budde, 205.
 Budge, 113.
 Bultmann, 209.
 Burial, 133.
 Cæsar-worship, 4, 12, 13, 14, 33.
 Caligula, 34, 138, 140.
 Campbell, 1, 10, 38.
 Canaanites, 57.
 Capital, 260, 263, 269.

- Carpenter, 36, 49.
Celsus, 6, 153.
 Chaldeans, 16, 18, 32.
 Charles, 12, 91, 160, 185, 193, 205, 206, 207, 210, 226, 227, 230.
 Chthonian gods, 99, 112, 198.
 Church, the Gentile, 47, 71, 72, 240, 241.
 Church, the Jewish, 41, 72, 234, 240.
 Cicero, 13, 18, 24, 25, 27, 40, 51, 130, 158, 168, 180, 202.
 Cilicia, 14, 88, 90, 106.
 Citizenship, Roman, 40, 136, 137.
 Civilisation, 248, 250, 251, 252, 253, 256, 275, 276, 277.
 Claudius, 34, 113, 140.
 Clay, 42.
 Clemen, 6, 19, 65, 78, 167, 171, 178, 204.
 Clement of Alexandria, 5, 97, 181.
 Cobern, 49, 73, 133.
 Commendatory Letters, 27.
 Communism, 129, 254.
 Contributions, 28, 134, 137.
 Conway, 69.
 Cornford, 66, 142, 148, 161, 187, 197, 199, 200, 201, 213, 221, 222.
 Cosmic egg, 108.
 Cowley, 11, 27, 48, 156.
Cumæum carmen, 69.
 Cumont, 8, 11, 15, 16, 18, 19, 21, 25, 31, 32, 34, 35, 37, 43, 67, 85, 94, 95, 96, 99, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 114, 128, 132, 134, 142, 143, 151, 157, 168, 179, 181, 187, 194, 195, 196, 197, 199, 201, 202, 210, 212, 213, 214, 221, 223.
 Cybele, 34, 35, 94, 97, 107, 164, 181.
 Cynics, 27, 165.
 Dea Roma, 13, 122.
 Death, 5, 24, 103, 150, 160, 175, 185, 186, 187, 188, 189, 190, 191, 194, 195, 199, 200, 204, 205, 207, 208, 217, 218, 219, 224, 274.
 Deification, 60, 76, 80, 175.
 Demeter, 89, 94, 101, 102, 103, 104, 174, 180.
 Demiurge, 108, 113.
 Demons, 13, 16, 18, 19, 43, 68, 109, 197, 218.
 De Morgan, 112.
 Deissmann, 27, 28, 29, 38, 82, 183, 190, 191, 236, 240, 272.
 Deissner, 76, 84, 273.
 Delaporte, 22, 23, 42, 156.
 Dessau, 13, 187.
Dialogue with his Soul, 20.
 Diaspora, 48, 90, 123, 137, 138.
 Dicæus, 197.
 Dieterich, 35.
 Digesta, 125.
 Dill, 96, 109, 130, 132, 181, 202, 203.
 Diodorus, 13, 102, 112, 157.
 Diogenes, 78, 222.
 Diogenes Laertius, 18, 200.
 Dion Cassius, 110, 173, 203.
 Dion of Prusa, 88, 89, 155.
 Dionysus, 33, 52, 89, 97, 98, 99, 101, 104, 121, 180, 198.
 Discipline, 135.
 Disraeli, 228.
 Doresche Reschumoth, 86.
 Dobschütz, 21, 140, 165, 233.
 Domitian, 41.
 Drows, 6.
 Driver, 163.
 Druids, 4, 34.
 Dualism, 10, 39, 109, 201, 244.
 Duchesne, 46.
 Duhm, 190.
 Eagle, 25, 198, 201, 203.
 Ecclesia, 78, 125.
 Economics, 2, 261, 263.
 Ecstasy, 17, 79, 83, 84, 116, 118, 158, 167, 168, 169, 170.
 Egypt, 94, 95, 96, 101, 165, 186, 195, 211, 213, 220, 221.
 Eisler, 28, 88, 98, 99, 100, 106, 108, 112, 173.
 Election, 5.
 Elements, the four (see "Stoicheia").
 Eleusinian Mysteries, 34, 94, 101, 102, 103, 105, 143, 199, 222.
 Elysian Fields, 25, 33, 199, 221.
 Empiricism, 272.
 Ennius, 197.
 Enoch, 65, 150, 207, 210, 212, 213.
 Environment, 1, 2, 15, 17, 18, 21, 25, 27, 29, 40, 41, 45, 69, 72, 73, 82, 91, 105, 115, 208, 214, 230, 252.
 Epic of Gilgamesh, 205.
 Epicharnus, 188.
 Epictetus, 22.
 Epicureans, the, 8, 22, 24, 26, 139, 187, 201, 203.
 Epiphanius, 11.
 Eranistai, 121.
 Erdmann, 6.
 Erinyes, 197.

- Erman, 195.
 Eschatology, 86, 91, 185, 186,
 203, 204, 209, 215.
 Esdras, 150.
 Essenes, 85, 165, 178.
 Eucken, 193, 246, 255, 270, 275.
 Euripides, 20, 40, 51, 78, 149, 180,
 188, 201.
 Eusebius, 34.
 Faith, 15, 18, 58, 90, 147, 208,
 237, 241, 242.
 Farnell, 12, 13, 21, 25, 26, 29, 42,
 68, 69, 85, 112, 113, 143,
 162, 165, 180, 196, 198, 199,
 210, 212, 222.
 Fate, 1, 16, 17, 18, 107, 115, 161,
 162.
 Felten, 8, 9, 21, 26, 49.
 Ferrero, 131.
 Firmicus Maternus, 181.
 Fish, sacred use of, 98, 159, 173.
 Flesh, 19, 64, 72, 149, 151, 153,
 191, 194.
 Fowler, 40, 69, 131.
 Foucart, 67, 94, 95, 101, 102, 103,
 104, 105, 165, 174, 186, 199,
 211, 220, 221, 222.
 Frazer, 25, 42, 83, 97, 104, 106,
 181, 186, 192, 205, 211, 212.
 Freedmen, 140.
 Freedom, 18, 74, 253, 254, 256,
 274.
 Freud, 152.
 Friedländer, 3, 8, 11, 12, 20, 22,
 25, 26, 28, 41, 48, 142, 147,
 199.
 Galloway, 192.
 Gamaliel, 31.
 Gehenna, 43, 177, 207.
 Ger Zedek, 176.
 Gerousia, 123.
 Ghosts, 197.
 Glory, 74, 75, 80, 219.
 Glover, 12, 21, 22, 43, 83, 84, 85,
 240.
 Gnosticism, 39, 69, 162.
 God, 7, 9, 15, 21, 39, 50, 51, 52,
 53, 54, 114, 163, 175, 193,
 209, 245, 256, 275.
 God, the unknown, 40, 53, 60, 61.
 Goguel, 83.
 Good Shepherd, the, 98, 112.
 Greeks, the, 10, 33, 50, 107.
 Grenier, 12, 40.
 Gressmann, 194.
 Guilds, the Pagan, 120 ff.
 Gunkel, 23, 88.
 Hades, 17, 68, 99, 198, 199, 200,
 202, 210, 221.
 Haering, 18, 167.
 Hammurabi, 42, 43.
 Hardy, E. G., 4.
 Hardy, T., 258.
 Hatch, E., 6, 28.
 Hatch, W. H. P., 15, 79, 105.
 Harnack, 35, 77, 127, 145, 241.
 Harrison, 42, 80, 83, 84, 96, 99,
 100, 102, 104, 147, 182.
 Haynes, 112.
 Hearing God, 60.
 Hecate, 97, 188.
 Hecataeus, 112.
 Hellenism, 38, 62, 86, 148, 230.
 Hera, 94.
 Heraclitus, 66, 148, 158, 187, 199.
 Hermes, 42, 67, 68, 89, 112, 113,
 114, 116, 188.
 Hermetic Corpus, 45, 49, 56, 59,
 67, 76, 78, 111, 115, 116, 159,
 188, 214, 223.
 Hermetic religion, 69, 114, 117, 143.
 Herodotus, 20, 33, 94, 95, 99, 197.
 Hero-worship, 13, 37.
 Hesiod, 25, 44, 102, 154.
 Hesychios, 68.
 Hilprecht, 19, 23, 112.
 Hippocrates, 164.
 Hippolytus, 98, 141, 178, 180, 201.
 Hopley, 229.
 Holy Spirit, 47, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76,
 77, 78, 80, 81, 91, 92, 145,
 153, 167, 169, 170, 217, 218,
 236, 237, 244, 249, 251, 271,
 272, 273, 274, 277.
 Holzinger, 163.
 Holtzmann, 17, 37, 234.
 Homer, 10, 20, 66, 112, 158, 161.
 Homeric Hymn, 103.
 Homeric religion, 99.
 Hommel, 16, 23.
 Horace, 44.
 Horus, 80, 94, 95.
 Huart, 16, 34, 68, 108, 109, 210.
 Hymn to Ishtar, 59.
 Hymn to Tammuz, 112.
 "Hymnodoi," 122.
 Hypodektes, 121.
 Iacchos, 104, 105.
 Iamblichus, 43, 112.
 Immortality, 7, 23, 25, 26, 84,
 143, 176, 180, 181, 186, 187,
 188, 191, 192, 193, 194, 195,
 196, 198, 199, 200, 201, 202,
 203, 204, 205, 209, 210, 215,
 221.

- Individualism, 127, 204, 253.
 Inge, 83, 86.
 Initiation, 85, 94, 100, 103, 162, 172, 173, 174, 175, 176, 177, 178, 181, 182, 199, 220, 221, 222.
 Inscriptions, 3, 28, 59, 72, 125, 187.
 Iranism, 107.
 Isis, 4, 34, 80, 94, 95, 96, 113, 143, 164, 172, 181, 189, 195, 203, 212, 221.
 Islands of the Blessed, 200.
 Jackson, 195, 241, 249.
 Jackson and Lake, 14, 33, 41, 43, 48, 72, 77, 78.
 Jastrow, 19, 22, 23, 34, 40, 42, 63, 104, 112, 148, 156, 173, 192, 195, 205, 206, 220.
 Jeans, 231.
 Jensen, 112.
 Jews, the, 10, 11, 34, 36, 75, 137, 138.
 John the Baptist, 148, 215, 230.
 Jones, 152.
 Judaism, 2, 7, 12, 15, 35, 43, 63, 84, 90, 144, 151, 153, 186, 189, 203, 204, 223, 230.
 Judgment, 215, 220, 221, 223, 224, 225.
 Judgment, Day of, 220, 221, 222, 224.
 Julius Cæsar, 13, 137, 139.
 Juster, 36, 41, 48, 123, 137, 138, 154, 155.
 Justin, 34, 67, 68, 171.
 Juvenal, 164.
 Kalhoff, 264.
 Kant, 7, 253.
 Katsuro Hara, 172.
 Kautsky, 264.
 Keil u. Premerstein, 39.
 Kennedy, 49, 51, 74, 75, 77, 86, 160, 162, 169, 170, 214.
 Ker, 197.
 Kern, 98, 143, 199.
 King, 19, 23, 31, 148, 206.
 Kingdom of God, 4, 215, 216, 217.
 Knowledge of God, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 237, 238.
 Kohler, 38, 43.
 Koine, 48.
 Kritias, 150.
 Labour, 28, 129, 133, 134, 263, 266.
 Lake, 39, 83, 111, 121, 162, 239.
 Langdon, 66, 194, 206, 211.
 Lares, 12, 13.
 Law, the, 5, 6, 68, 75, 153.
 Legge, 31, 39, 99, 151.
 Lex Julia, 125.
 Liddell and Scott, 120.
 Light, 55, 56, 108.
 Livy, 13, 120.
 Lods, 12, 180, 206.
 Logia, 71.
 Logos, 54, 64, 66, 67.
 Loisy, 83.
 Lord, the, 70, 71, 72.
 Lord's Supper, 26, 178, 179, 180, 181, 196, 218.
 Lovefeasts, 125, 127, 173.
 Lucan, 95.
 Lucretius, 24.
 Lueken, 36, 53.
 LXX., 49, 54, 55, 56, 57, 61, 65, 71, 76, 80.
 Lydia, 88.
 Macalister, 1.
 Maccabees, 213.
 MacCurdy, 231.
 Macintyre, 210, 226.
 Magic, 28, 161.
 Magic Papyri, 19, 35, 80, 163, 168.
 Manetho, 112, 113.
 Maranatha, 72, 91, 183.
 Marchant, 192, 193, 195, 207, 210, 221.
 Marcion, 231, 241.
 Marduk, 17, 23, 34, 63, 112, 194.
 Maret, 37.
 Marriage, 46, 94, 154, 165, 166, 167, 254.
 Marriage, spiritual, 79, 167.
 Maspero, 15.
 Matter, 7, 18.
 Mau, 95, 113, 130, 132.
 Mayor, 69.
 Mead, 45, 49, 54, 55, 56, 60, 65, 66, 78, 79, 80, 101, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 139, 159, 168, 182, 188, 208, 214.
 Mediator, 7, 63, 64, 65, 67, 108.
 Melanippides, 52.
 Menander, 20.
 Menzies, 130.
 Meursius, 147.
 Meyer, 111.
 Milligan, 27, 71, 73, 74, 124, 125, 126, 149, 181, 189, 213.
 Mithraism, 32, 56, 75, 85, 89, 90, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 134, 143, 151, 157, 174, 180, 201, 212, 222.

- Mithras, 67, 90, 94, 106, 107, 108,
 109, 143, 193, 201, 212, 223.
 Moffatt, 129.
 "Molpoi," 122.
 Mommsen, 140.
 Monotheism, 16, 50, 64, 244, 257.
 Morality, 3, 9.
 Moret et Davy, 31, 42, 63, 95,
 126, 196, 220, 221.
 Morgan, 19, 27, 185, 219.
 Müller, 42.
 Murray, 33, 40, 44, 46, 69, 84,
 99, 103, 112, 113, 149, 197.
 Mystery, 54, 55, 82, 83, 90.
 Mystery Guilds, 68, 87.
 Mystery Religions, 11, 12, 23,
 40, 49, 55, 59, 60, 62, 69,
 79, 80, 83, 84, 85, 87, 94,
 96, 117, 142, 156, 199, 221, 250.
 Mystic Way, 82, 83, 93, 233.
 Mysticism, 16, 82, 83, 86, 91, 93,
 94, 96, 118, 177, 239, 273.

 Nägeli, 192.
 Nature, 15, 103, 195, 254, 258,
 259, 271.
 Naville, 49, 73.
 Neoplatonism, 42, 111.
 Neopythagoreans, the, 15, 19, 24,
 167.
 Nero, 41, 95, 110, 130, 140, 203.
 Norden, 40, 50, 55, 61, 111.
 Nous, 56, 74, 76, 77, 78, 79, 115.

 Odes of Solomon, 58, 87, 168.
 Onesimus, 23, 130.
 "Orgeones," 120, 121.
 Origin, 6, 35.
 Orpheus, 98, 99, 112, 199.
 Orphic life, the, 143.
 Orphic tablets, 84, 99, 100, 178.
 Orphism, 28, 39, 79, 80, 85, 97,
 98, 99, 100, 147, 153, 162,
 173, 198, 199, 210, 212, 221,
 222.
 Osiris, 94, 95, 104, 173, 186, 193,
 195, 196, 211, 212, 221.
 Otto, 82.
Oxyrhynchus Texts, 95.

 Pagan morality, 3, 13, 21, 147.
 Pagan tribunals, 46, 127, 138.
 Panætius, 26.
 Papyri, 11, 12, 28, 48, 55, 124,
 125, 126, 149, 213.
 Parousia, 28, 71, 185, 209, 215,
 216, 217, 235, 239.
 Patriotism, 139, 140, 203, 261,
 262, 263.

 Patroclus, 158.
 Paulinism, 105, 228, 236, 243.
 Paulinus of Nola, 173.
 Pausanias, 97.
 Pedersen, 206.
 Pelasgian, 112.
 Penitential Psalms, 40, 148.
 Perfect, the, 76.
 Perga, 123.
 Perrier, 203, 208.
 Persecution, 110, 141.
 Persephone, 97, 103, 174.
 Perseus, 89.
 Persson, 33, 96, 99, 101, 104.
 Pessimism, 19, 20, 39, 44, 162,
 244.
 Petrie, 195, 221.
 Peyrony, 192.
 Pharisees, 4.
 Philemon, 78.
 Philo, 15, 58, 64, 65, 67, 76, 77,
 79, 87, 149, 152, 160, 169,
 208.
 Philosophy, 6, 236, 237.
 Philosophy of history, 4, 238.
 Phratra, 127.
 Phyle, 122, 127.
 Pinches, 17, 23.
 Pindar, 196, 200.
Pistis Sophia, 216.
 Plato, 1, 6, 39, 50, 142, 150, 152,
 153, 158, 174, 188, 200, 222.
 Pliny, the elder, 12, 15, 34, 110,
 266.
 Plutarch, 19, 26, 38, 78, 95, 109,
 150, 155, 158, 197.
 "Pneumatikoi," the, 75, 79.
 Poland, 33, 42, 68, 69, 89, 94,
 95, 96, 97, 113, 114, 120, 121,
 122, 123, 125, 126, 127, 128,
 129, 132, 133, 134, 135, 139,
 156, 162, 182.
 Porphyry, 43, 143, 174.
 Posidonius, 111, 142, 168.
 Pragmatism, 261, 273.
 Preachers, itinerant, 27, 28.
 Predestination, 18, 115, 258.
 Presbyter, 125.
 Prodicus, 180.
 "Psychikoi," the, 79.
 Psychology, 12, 48, 115.
 Psychopomp, 113, 201.
 Pythagoras, 200.
 Pythagoreans, 100, 153, 199, 213.

 Ra, 195, 221.
 Ramsay, 35, 41, 44, 69, 113, 142,
 155.
 Rationalism, 272.

- Rebirth, 87, 100, 113.
 Redemption, 5, 6, 98, 160, 162, 191, 210, 245.
 Regeneration, 175, 182.
 Reinach, 69, 85, 97, 98, 105, 143, 199.
 Reitzenstein, 35, 38, 48, 49, 51, 52, 53, 54, 56, 60, 62, 66, 69, 78, 79, 84, 86, 111, 112, 113, 114, 116, 139, 151, 168, 189, 208, 214, 223, 238.
 Religion, nature of, 136.
 Religion and morality, 61, 80, 106, 109, 116, 141, 142, 144, 270.
 Religion, Assyrian, 59.
 — Babylonian, 18, 40, 112, 211.
 — Egyptian, 15, 35, 59, 172.
 — Greek, 27, 33, 54, 59, 83, 96, 100, 107, 172.
 — Syrian, 31, 32, 33.
 Rendel Harris, 51, 67.
 Repentance, 4, 144, 177, 215, 261.
 Resurrection, 27, 74, 103, 105, 187, 190, 193, 204, 207, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 219, 220, 224.
 Retribution, 7, 99, 143, 207.
 Revelation, 61, 73, 84, 90, 105, 115, 230.
 Robertson, 49.
 Rogers, 23, 31, 40, 112, 223.
 Rohde, 34, 37, 39, 70, 99, 104, 105, 142, 143, 168, 182, 187, 196, 198, 205, 221.
 Romans, the, 33, 35, 36, 41, 109, 202, 222.
 Roman Empire, 14, 34, 109, 125, 137, 140, 141, 262.
 Rome, 2, 3, 4, 41.
 Rosetta stone, 113.
 Rostovtzeff, 23, 34, 136, 142, 156, 180.
 Sacraments, the, 91, 171, 172, 182, 183.
 Sacramental, the, 171 ff.
 Sacred families, 67, 104.
 St. John's Gospel, 56, 58, 60, 64, 66, 71, 87, 153.
 St. Paul's apologetic, 236, 239.
 St. Paul's language, 28, 48, 49, 87, 91, 117.
 St. Paul's preaching, 133, 240.
 Saintliness, 37.
 Salvation, 5, 68, 98, 161, 162, 163, 164, 175, 183, 191, 274.
 Sandan, 29, 41, 42, 88, 89, 106, 203.
 Sallustius, 149.
 Sanday and Headlam, 6.
 Saviour, 29, 68, 69, 70, 162.
 Sayce, 211.
 Scheftelowitz, 173, 192, 193, 207, 223.
 Schmidt, 72, 86.
 Schubart u. Kuhn, 28.
 Scott, 111, 112, 208.
 Scott-Moncrieff, 95, 96, 164, 195, 196.
 Seeing God, 56, 57, 58, 59.
 Semele, 97.
 Seneca, 12, 18, 22, 26, 52, 164, 222, 223.
 Serapis, 94, 96, 181, 203.
 Sergius Paulus, 140, 262.
 Sex-morality, 154, 165, 166, 270.
 Sextus Empiricus, 180, 200.
 Shechinah, 169.
 Sheol, 160, 189, 193, 205, 206, 207, 210, 212.
Shepherd of Hermas, 111, 147.
Sibylline Oracles, 65.
 Simon Magus, 35.
 Sin, 5, 16, 18, 19, 52, 118, 144, 149, 150, 151, 154, 174, 183, 210, 260, 261.
 Sin, original, 38, 98, 99, 150.
 Slaves, 3, 22, 105, 130.
 Socrates, 1, 20, 200.
 Solidarity, 4, 215.
 Son of Man, 241.
 Son of God, 14, 63, 64, 65, 70, 234.
 Sophists, 28.
 Sophocles, 188.
 Soshyans, 212.
 Soul, 7, 19, 84, 158, 159, 160, 187, 196, 200, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 212, 213, 214.
 Sovereignty of God, 4, 15, 16, 227.
 "Speira," 123, 127.
 Spirits, malevolent, 19, 179, 192, 197, 202.
 Spiritual body, 24, 25, 27, 75, 177, 211, 213, 214, 218, 219, 226.
 State, the intermediate, 210, 216.
 State-religions, 12, 79, 85, 99, 105, 110, 241.
 "Stoicheia," 16, 43, 54, 175.
 Stoics, the, 3, 6, 8, 9, 13, 16, 20, 21, 22, 24, 26, 64, 76, 158, 165, 187, 188, 201.
 Suetonius, 4, 140.
 Suidas, 104.

- Sulla, 95, 120.
 Syncretism, 31, 34, 88, 229, 230, 232, 233.
 Synedrion, 123.
 "Synodos," 127.
 Tabi-utul-Bêl, 40.
 Tacitus, 4, 12, 13, 21.
 Tammuz, 42, 112, 193, 197, 211.
 Tarhu, 88.
 Tarsus, 2, 8, 11, 14, 29, 31, 38, 40, 42, 48, 85, 86, 87, 88, 90, 106, 122, 123, 127, 138, 155.
 Tartarus, 199, 221.
 Taurobolium, 181, 182.
 "Taxis," 123.
 Taylor, 7.
 Tertullian, 34, 141, 173, 174.
 Teschup, 88, 89.
Testament of the XII Patriarchs, 212.
 Tetzal, 248.
 Theocrasia, 50.
 "Therapeutai," 122, 127, 165.
 "Thiasoi," 121, 126, 127.
 Thoth, 78, 94, 112, 113, 221.
 Tiberius, 13, 34.
 Titans, the, 97, 98.
 Tobit, 11.
 Toleration, 3, 31, 34, 35.
 Torah, the, 57.
 Tradition, 2, 243, 244.
 Underhill, 93, 235.
 Valentinus, 216.
 Vernes, 191.
 Vespasian, 110.
 Virgil, 69.
 Visions, 57, 167, 168.
 Waddell, 89.
 Waser, 159.
 Washington Codex, 151.
 Weigall, 197.
 Weinell, 174, 186.
 Weinreich, 40.
 Weiss, 38, 64, 72, 86, 145, 177, 178, 182, 190, 210, 218, 230, 234, 244, 245.
 Welch, 207.
 Wernle, 10, 91, 235, 236, 238.
 Wessely, 80, 177.
 Wetter, 47, 168.
 Wicked, the, 185, 219, 221, 222, 224, 226, 227.
 Windisch, 41, 43.
 Wine, 26, 97, 179, 180, 181, 182.
 Wisdom of Solomon, 60, 150.
 Wissowa, 13.
 Women, 101, 102, 105, 133, 154, 155, 156, 254.
 Work, the Gospel of, 264, 265, 266.
 World, 7, 17, 43, 44, 245, 246, 247, 258.
 Wrede, 234.
 Xenophon, 101.
 Zagreus, 78, 97, 98, 174, 180.
 Zeus, 69, 78, 88, 96, 97, 148, 161, 174, 180.
 Zosimos, 214.

PRINTED BY
MORRISON AND GIBB LTD.
EDINBURGH

4527
1R

THE
EDINBURGH
LIBRARY
OF
THE
SCOTLAND
YACHTING
CLUB
1880

225.8S
W698

32

W698

St. Paul and paganism

1000

N20

84543

225.85
W 69.8

